

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 150 412

CE 014 810

TITLE Proceedings of the Invitational Conference on Continuing Education, Manpower Policy and Lifelong Learning (Leesburg, Virginia, January 10-11, 1977).

INSTITUTION National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education, Washington, D.C.

PUB DATE Jan 77

NOTE 67p.

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$3.50 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Adult Education; Adults; Business Responsibility; Conference Reports; *Continuous Learning; Educational Change; *Educational Needs; Educational Policy; Federal Legislation; Federal Programs; *Government Role; Job Training; Labor Education; Manpower Development; *Policy Formation; Public Policy; School Industry Relationship; Speeches

IDENTIFIERS Comprehensive Employment and Training Act; *Higher Education Act Title I; United States

ABSTRACT

This document contains the proceedings of a conference for representatives of organized labor, business and industry, postsecondary institutions, and federal agencies which was held to (1) discuss adult learning needs and opportunities in the United States, and (2) make recommendations on those adult learning issues which ought to be matters of public policy development. This publication begins with a scope of work statement outlining the conference purposes and suggesting some of the key issues followed by the welcome and charge to the conference participants. The next section is a compilation of the presentations of five guest speakers. The presentation titles and the speakers are (1) "Labor and Continuing Education" by J.C. Turner, (2) "Business and Continuing Education" by Charles Brown, Jr., (3) "Educational Practice and Industrial Custom" by Paul Miller, (4) "Government and Continuing Education" by Albert Quie, and (5) "Education, Manpower, and Government" by Jacob Javits. Then follow two summary statements on the workshop sessions in which all conference attendees participated. Concluding this document is a list developed by the conference participants of forty-seven recommendations for federal action relevant to the conference topic. The conference agenda, a list of conference participants, and the amended version of Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 are appended. (EM)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED150412

**Proceedings
of the
Invitational Conference on
Continuing Education, Manpower Policy
and Lifelong Learning**

- Labor
- Business
- Postsecondary Institutions
- Federal Government

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Sponsored by



The National Advisory Council on
Extension and Continuing Education

CE 014 810

Prepared by the
National Advisory Council on
Extension and Continuing Education
425 Thirteenth Street, N.W. — Suite 529
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 376-8888

**NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL
ON EXTENSION AND
CONTINUING EDUCATION**

Public Members

DR. ARMAND L. HUNTER, Chairman
*Director, The Continuing Education Service
Michigan State University*

DR. JOHN L. BLACKBURN
*Vice Chancellor for University Resources
University of Denver*

DR. NANCY M. BOYKIN
*Director, Continuing Education for Girls
Detroit Public Schools*

DR. ALLEN COMMANDER
*Vice President for Public Affairs
University of Houston*

MRS. RUTH O. CRASSWEILER
*Duluth Airport Authority
Duluth, Minnesota*

DR. JOHN B. ERVIN
*Dean, School of Continuing Education
Washington University (St. Louis)*

DR. LEE R. KOLMER
*Dean, College of Agriculture
Iowa State University*

DR. C. H. LAWSHE
*Vice President Emeritus
Purdue University*

MS. ROSALIND K. LORING
*Dean, College of Continuing Education
University of Southern California*

MR. KENNETH T. LYONS
*President, National Association for
Government Employees
President, International Brotherhood
of Police Officers*

MISS PAMELA ROGERS
*Law Student
Washington & Lee University*

DR. DANIEL E. MARVIN, JR., Chairman-elect
*President
Eastern Illinois University*

Federal Government Members

MR. GILBERT ANDERSON
*Senior Analyst, Bureau of Educational
and Cultural Affairs,
Department of State*

MR. ALLISON BRYANT
*Technical Program Training Coordinator
Department of Housing
and Urban Development*

MR. THOMAS W. CARR
*Director of Defense Education
Office of the Assistant Secretary
Department of Defense*

MR. LLOYD FELDMAN
*Deputy Director, Office of Policy and
Planning, Employment
and Training Administration
Department of Labor*

MS. SYLVIA G. McCOLLUM
*Education Administrator
Bureau of Prisons
Department of Justice*

MR. CHARLES W. McDOUGALL
*Deputy Administrator Operations
Extension Service
Department of Agriculture*

DR. PRESTON VALIEN
*Director, College and University Unit
Bureau of Postsecondary Education
U.S. Office of Education*

Delegate to the Council

DR. J. EUGENE WELDEN
*Chief, Community Service and
Continuing Education Programs
U.S. Office of Education*

Staff

DR. JAMES A. TURMAN
Executive Director

MRS. JESSIE H. EXUM
Administrative Officer

MR. RICHARD F. MCCARTHY
Associate Director

MRS. DORI POTTER
Secretary

MRS. JESSIE K. ULIN
Director, Research and Evaluation

MISS OLIVIA FLEMING
Secretary

CONTENTS

Foreword	1	Government and Continuing	
Scope of Work of the		Education	29
Conference	2	Honorable Albert H. Quie	
Welcome	6	Committee on Education and Labor,	
Dr. Armand L. Hunter		U.S. House of Representatives	
<i>Chairman, NACECE</i>		Introducing the Honorable	
Welcoming Comments	7	Jacob K. Javits	33
Mr. Willard H. Duetting		Dr. Armand L. Hunter	
<i>Director, Xerox International Center</i>		Education, Manpower, and	
<i>for Training and Management</i>		Government	34
<i>Development</i>		Honorable Jacob K. Javits	
The Charge to the Conference	9	Committee on Labor and Public	
Dr. Daniel E. Marvin, Jr.		Welfare, U.S. Senate	
<i>Chairman-Elect, NACECE</i>		Summary of First Workshop	
Introducing Mr. J. C. Turner	12	Session and Charge to the	
Dr. Armand L. Hunter		Concluding Session	38
Labor and Continuing Education	13	Dr. Herbert A. Levine	
Mr. J. C. Turner		<i>Director, Labor Education Center</i>	
<i>General President, International Union</i>		Rutgers University	
<i>of Operating Engineers</i>		Summary of Workshop Sessions	
Introducing Mr. Charles L. Brown, Jr.	16	and Recommendations	42
Dr. Armand L. Hunter		Ms. Sylvia G. McCollum	
Business and Continuing Education	17	<i>Education Administrator, Bureau of</i>	
Mr. Charles L. Brown, Jr.		Prisons, U.S. Department of	
<i>Vice Chairman of the Board and Chief</i>		Justice	
<i>Financial Officer, American</i>		Recommendations of the	
<i>Telephone and Telegraph</i>		Workshops	44
<i>Company</i>		Appendix A:	
Introducing Dr. Paul A. Miller	21	Conference Agenda	48
Dr. Armand L. Hunter		Appendix B:	
Educational Practice and		Conference Participants	50
Industrial Custom	22	Appendix C: Title I of the Higher	
Dr. Paul A. Miller		Education Act of 1965	
<i>President, Rochester Institute of</i>		(P.L. 89-329, as amended)	55
<i>Technology</i>			
Introducing the Honorable			
Albert H. Quie	28		
Dr. Armand L. Hunter			

Foreword

On January 10 and 11, 1977, the National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education sponsored an Invitational Conference on Continuing Education, Manpower Policy, and Lifelong Learning at the Xerox International Center for Training and Management Development in Leesburg, Virginia.

The purpose of the Conference was to bring together representatives of organized labor, business and industry, postsecondary institutions, and Federal agencies to discuss adult learning needs and opportunities in the United States, and to make recommendations to the Advisory Council on those issues of adult learning which ought to be matters of public policy development.

This document contains the proceedings of the Conference. It includes the scope of work statement prepared by the Conference planning committee to outline the purposes of the Conference and to suggest some of the key issues which might promote further discussion by participants; the major presentations by the five guest speakers; and two summary statements on the workshop sessions in which all Conference attendees participated. Appendix A gives the Conference agenda. Appendix B provides a list of participants and the organizations they represent. Appendix C contains the recently amended version of Title I, Part A ("community service and continuing education") and Part B ("lifelong learning") of the Higher

Education Act of 1965. Section 112 of the title contains the authorization and mandate of the National Advisory Council.

Summaries of the recommendations and issues developed by Conference participants in the workshop sessions appear on pages 44-47. They are grouped in nine broad categories. The Council is committed to reviewing and considering these recommendations and issues and to taking follow-up action on those which the Council believes are appropriate to its mandate.

The Council's initial response to the results of the Conference have been incorporated into the Council's *Eleventh Annual Report to the President*, which contains specific recommendations to the President, to the Congress, and to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare regarding the Federal role in the promotion of lifelong learning. This report is available upon request.

During the coming year, the Council will continue to review many of the Conference recommendations, with the assistance of individuals who represent the training and education interests of labor organizations and business and industry.

The Council is indebted to the many men and women who contributed to the success of the Conference and who spoke so vigorously on behalf of the learning needs of the American adult population.

Scope of Work of the Conference

(The following statement was prepared by the Conference Planning Committee and distributed to all participants in advance of the Conference. Its purpose was twofold: to define the objectives of the Conference, and to generate discussion by raising issues related to its themes.)

The National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education is convening a conference for one hundred specially invited national leaders on the subject of continuing education, manpower policy, and lifelong learning. The conference will take place at the Xerox International Center for Training and Management Development in Leesburg, Virginia, on Monday and Tuesday, January 10 and 11, 1977.

The objective of this conference is to provide an opportunity for representatives from organized labor, business and industry, postsecondary institutions, and the Federal government to share their ideas and concerns about the educational opportunities needed by the American labor force, currently the largest group of students in postsecondary institutions, and the largest single group who are potential participants in postsecondary continuing education.

Key Questions

Among the questions we are concerned with are these:

1. Should workers receive educational benefits as an individual right, as a negotiated fringe benefit, as the prerogative of management, as a function of government, or as earned credits accumulated with years of service?
2. What evidence is there of the success or failure of the programs currently available through unilateral or cooperative arrangements between labor and business?
3. What type of tax relief has been considered to (a) encourage business organizations to sponsor and actively promote paid education programs; (b) encourage business organizations to invest funds in internal training for mobility; and (c) encourage individuals to continue their education?
4. Are government agencies and the universities actively pursuing the concept of extension programs for the industrial sector similar to those of the agricultural extension service?
5. Is it necessary to revamp the structure and programs of the continuing education and extension divisions of universities so that they will concern themselves with the manpower education and training programs needed by industry and the government?
6. What is the best way to finance programs for continuing and lifelong education for adults?
7. What Federal agencies and departments can effectively apply resources to the objectives and goals highlighted by this Conference?

In posing these questions and in convening this Conference, the Council has purposefully selected participants who represent those organizations which are the primary parties involved in supporting educational programs for adults. The contributions of these participants are critically needed for systematic develop-

ment of national policies directly related to adult learning needs.

It is our purpose to focus on the educational needs of organized labor and business and industry. Through this conference, the Council hopes to provide a national forum where those who are most directly concerned with the educational priorities of employees and their employers may discuss among themselves and with university representatives and Federal policymakers the strengths and weaknesses of the American system of postsecondary educational alternatives in responding to adult learning needs.

Council Mandate

The Council is authorized by the Higher Education Act of 1965 and is required by law to report to the President, the Congress, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Council reports on (a) Title I of the Act ("community service and continuing education"); and (b) the administration and effectiveness of all federally supported extension and continuing education programs of the Federal government. The Council has also accepted a special responsibility for the welfare of adult, part-time students who participate in postsecondary educational activities.

The Council is composed of twelve public members appointed by the President, and includes persons "knowledgeable in the fields of extension and continuing education, State and local officials, and other persons having special knowledge . . . with respect to community problems, and persons representative of the general public." In addition, eight Federal representatives serve on the Council, appointed by the departmental secretaries or the heads of the various agencies which provide support for postsecondary continuing education.

The Council views postsecondary continuing education as making a major contribution to the social and economic welfare of the Nation. Through continuing education, the Nation's colleges and universities contribute directly to meeting the educational needs of employees and their employers; help resolve issues of employment and unemployment; meet worker demands for education; and respond to the job-related and personal needs of individuals.

The Council is concerned about the degree to which postsecondary institutions and Federal agencies understand fully the education needs of employees, especially those in orga-

nized labor, and whether they are prepared to design, support, and deliver the kinds of educational services that meet the specific needs of labor, business, and industry.

The Need for a National Conference

Thoughtful contributions toward a productive relationship between the worlds of work and education are being made by a variety of individuals, groups, and agencies; but the United States has not as yet been able to organize a national discussion of these matters comparable to that which has been achieved by the industrialized nations of Europe.

The United States does not have an orderly way for the primary parties to think and work together at the national and State levels about the linkages between work and education. We need an American version of the European capability for such dialogue and action.

The international discussions and activities in the area of work and education, which have included such concepts and practices as paid educational leave, recurrent and continuing education, and lifelong learning, have resulted in the passage of conventions and recommendations at the International Labor Organization; multinational studies and publications by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development; and in new and innovative efforts by labor, management, and government to increase educational opportunities for workers and their families through unilateral actions, collective bargaining, and/or legislation. In recent years, France, Germany, Belgium, England, and Sweden have established national programs for financing and providing for educational opportunities for adults. In almost every case, progress was made only after extensive dialogue among the parties concerned had taken place. It took more than seven years, for example, before the ILO adopted its resolution on paid educational leave.

The United States has not been completely unaware of the need for new and creative education and training policy and programs. Willard Wirtz expressed our awareness by suggesting: "There is a very general concern around the country today that education and work have somehow gotten out of kilter and nobody quite knows what that means." We have seen the passage of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act, the Higher Education Act, the blossoming of career education and occupational education, and the development of com-

munity colleges.

Despite legislative activity at the Federal level, the United States still does not have at its disposal a central focus for encouraging and promoting a national dialogue on the public use of continuing education or its value as a national investment. The United States is still years away from establishing an effective national, State, and local effort that can assess the needs of organized labor and business organizations and convey these needs realistically to both the Federal and State governments and to the Nation's postsecondary educational resources.

Precedent to such efforts is the need to make labor and management aware of, comfortable with, and assertive in the area of educational policy as it is related to the education and training of employed and unemployed adults and those who are about to enter or return to the world of work. Precedent also is the necessity for professional educators to play a more significant role in these developments. It is startling to read in the OECD report on paid educational leave about the minimal, almost non-existent, role of professional education in developing the education and training programs sought by management and labor groups. We have only to refer to the limited knowledge and interest of American educators in the plans, programs, and resources available through labor-management negotiated educational benefits to see that educators at home, like their international counterparts, have until recently generally ignored the existence and potential of out-of-school education.

It appears evident, also, that legislators have responded to specific crises and to educational lobbying efforts without serious attempts at comprehensive long-range planning which might integrate more effectively the activities of the primary parties in meeting the educational needs of the American labor force.

Planning, research, and program development is required to provide management, labor, government, and professional educators with the opportunity to assess the availability and quality of education and training opportunities for employees and their families and to engage in mutual efforts to meet individual and community needs.

Scope of the Conference

This conference is concerned with exploring the broadest possible approaches to meeting

the needs of working and non-working adults for vocational, general, civic, labor, and management education through continuing part-time and short-term residential opportunities on the campus and/or in the workplaces of the United States. Attention will be directed to the variety and extent of unilateral and collectively negotiated education and training plans; include introspective commentary on the extent of financial and program efforts being conducted in cooperation with other primary parties. A portion of each presentation will focus on a forward look at current trends and areas of potential development for continuing education and lifelong learning.

Following these major presentations, the four speakers will be invited to engage in an informal response to the presentations. This discussion will be followed by an open question period, in which participants at the conference will address questions to the speakers.

Throughout the remainder of the first day and during the morning of the second day (Tuesday, January 11), the representatives of the four organizational groups participating in the conference will convene in workshop sessions of between sixteen and twenty persons each, with each workshop representing a cross-section of the organizational interests.

Each of the workshops will be asked to react to the issues identified by the keynote speakers. More specifically, the workshop participants will be invited to begin an open discussion of the relevant issues, as seen from their organizational perspectives, and to work toward areas of agreement and disagreement that would reflect the common concerns of all participants.

With the aid of discussion leaders, the workshops will identify specific areas affecting adult learning and make recommendations for further consideration and elaboration by the National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education.

To achieve consensus on some of these issues would be sufficient justification for convening the conference. It is, however, the ultimate objective of the Council that these presentations and workshops provide the basis for the Council's detailed policy recommendations on adult learning opportunities, to be submitted to the President, the Congress, and the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on March 31, 1977.

Outcome

The Council believes that by providing a national forum on educational policy development which includes the direct participation of organized labor, business and industry, postsecondary institutions, and the Federal government, it is performing a vital public service to all parties and to the American adult learner.

By seeking this input and by strengthening the dialogue among the primary parties concerned with education for adults, the Council hopes to establish more firmly at the national level a visibility and a concern for critical educational issues that cut across and surmount the political, social, and economic life of the Nation.

The formulation of recommendations affect-

ing policymaking at the national level is only the first step in this effort. Legislative changes are needed to reflect these policies. These can best occur when the primary parties involved in supporting learning opportunities for adults express their needs, achieve a more common understanding regarding educational priorities, and have at their disposal the means to relay these needs and priorities to decisionmakers at the national level of government.

This conference proposes to begin that process. Through on-going dialogue with labor and management leaders, educational administrators, and Federal officials and legislators, it will be the responsibility of the Council to continue the process.

Welcome

Dr. Armand L. Hunter
Chairman, NACECE



On behalf of the National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education, I am very pleased to extend to you our warmest and most sincere welcome to this special "Invitational Conference on Continuing Education, Manpower Policy, and Lifelong Learning."

As you know, the Council is a body of 12 Presidentially-appointed public members and 8 Federal members representing Presidentially-designated Federal agencies having extension education responsibilities, and was created and officially authorized under Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

In order to identify the Council — your "host" for this Conference — a little better for you, let me add that it is required by law to report to the President, the Congress, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare annually on the administration and policies governing the implementation of Title I — "community services and continuing education;" the coordination and elimination of duplication of programs established under this title and other Federal programs offering extension or continuing education services; and the review of the administration and effective-

ness of all Federally supported extension and continuing education programs.

With the Education Amendments of 1976, the mandate of Title I has been broadened with an expansion and redefinition of continuing education, the addition of a provision for resource and material sharing, and the addition of an extensive new Part B aimed at opening up the full range of the lifelong learning educational opportunities. These additions and changes have expanded the role and responsibilities of the Council, and this Conference represents a very sincere effort to reflect our concerns and to enlist your insight, information, experience, and assistance in the development of recommendations, resources, and policies relating to the solution and resolution of some of the most significant educational problems and issues of our nation.

We are delighted that you are here. We are looking forward to meeting and working with you, and the Council would like to express its most sincere thanks for your interest and participation, as well as its warmest welcome to this Invitational Conference on the educational needs of our people, in which we share a common concern.

Welcoming Comments

Mr. Willard H. Duetting
Director, Xerox International
Center for Training and
Management Development

(Dr. Hunter:

And now I would like to introduce Mr. Willard H. Duetting, Director of the Xerox International Center for Training and Management Development for the Xerox Corporation. Mr. Duetting is here to welcome us on behalf of our joint host, the Xerox Center.

Mr. Duetting earned his Bachelor of Science degree in electrical engineering from Washington University in St. Louis and served as the Western Michigan District Manager for the Air Reduction Sales Company for 10 years previous to serving as vice-president of the Cash Register Division of R. C. Allen Business Machines for 14 years. He joined Xerox in 1960 as branch manager in Detroit and moved through several zone managerial positions from 1961 to 1967. Since then, he has served in several administrative and management assignments, assuming his present position in April of 1972.

I am most happy to introduce Willard Duetting, Director of the Xerox International Center.)

Thank you very much, Dr. Hunter.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am really very pleased to welcome all of you here to our International Center for Training and Management Development. I sincerely hope your next several days here will be very productive and pleasant. Our staff will be standing by at all times to answer any questions. And also to steer you in the right direction just in case you might get lost here in the facility. After all, it is rather large and people have been known to get lost, but not for very long.

Since some of you may have questions as to why Xerox spent a great deal of money to build

this sort of facility, what I would like to do is to give you a quick overview of why we are here and what this center is all about.

I am sure that many of you are aware of the growth that Xerox has had since 1960, going from revenues of \$37 million at the end of 1960 to a bit over \$4 billion last year. In terms of employees, it has gone from 2,500 employees at the end of 1960 to approximately 100,000 worldwide today.

Several years ago our senior management determined that if we were to continue with this kind of growth and continue to be a successfully operated and run corporation, we would need to pay particular attention to the training and the education and development of all of our people. They also determined that the best way to do that was to have a centralized training facility which would address the training needs of the entire corporation — not just the xerographic portion of it, which handles the copiers and duplicators, but the education group, computer services, office systems division and others. It was seen as necessary that we actually develop all of our people — sales, service, management — and we are doing just that.

When we opened here, we actually consolidated five regional technical training centers scattered throughout the country, and two sales training centers. We have also brought in more and more of our management training, and eventually we will do all of that here.

I think there are some rather unusual things we do here in terms of industrial-type training, and I might just mention a couple of them.

One is that we established what we call an

Education Services Group. This is a small cadre of professional educators, PhD's who have responsibility for making sure that everything we do in terms of training here at the center is educationally sound and the best we can possibly produce in terms of effective training programs, and in terms of design, content, and teaching methodology.

In addition to that the group is also responsible for evaluating all our programs, for making sure that instructors are actually teaching the way they should be, and also that the things being taught are the things necessary for success out in the field, both from a sales and a technical standpoint.

We do field evaluations of our people to make sure that they are actually doing the kinds of things they have been taught here in the center, and that those are viable, valid things to be doing to achieve success in both sales and in the technical end of the business. If we find they are not, why then we have to change our programs, our curriculum. So there is constant ongoing maintenance of all of our programs.

Now, the other thing that is rather unusual, I would think, is that our instructional staff for sales and technical training are actually not professional instructors. We actually select our instructors from the field organization. They are men and women who have been identified as the top performers in sales and in service, in the field, and in addition have been identified as having a potential to move into management eventually. We screen papers on these candidates and decide which ones we want for interviews, we talk to them, and then we make our selection.

They are brought here for a period of 30 to 36 months tenure, after which, if they have performed

well and if we still feel that they have the capability of moving into management, they go back out into the field, or to Rochester, or to other parts of the company into first line management positions.

We use this program as a step in a career ladder, as it were. This insures there is always a very strong desire on the part of the people in the field to come to the center, and as a result we get the top people instructing here at the center.

Now, obviously they have never taught before, so we have to teach them how to instruct and perform in the classroom. That is another one of the responsibilities of the Education Services Group and the school management, both technical and sales. They put the new instructors through about a two to three month training program at the end of which they become very effective instructors.

The center, as you noted, is rather large. It has accommodations to handle 1,014 students in residence at one time. The actual square footage is 1,200,000. We have very complete audio-visual capabilities, and closed circuit TV in all of the classrooms. And we have a complete A-V group — a graphics group, which actually produces all of our training and support materials here in the center.

The center itself is pretty much self-contained. We have a barber and beauty shop, medical facility, gift shop, newsstand, small resource center, library, cocktail lounge, snack bar, and dining room that will accommodate about 750 people at one time.

That is a brief overview of the center. Again, I want to say how wonderful it is to have you here, and I hope you have a great meeting.

Thank you.

The Charge to the Conference

Dr. Daniel E. Marvin, Jr.
Chairman-Elect, NACECE



(Dr. Hunter:

I would like to introduce the Chairman-Elect of our Council and Chairman of the Council's Standing Committee on Continuing Education Policy, which has designed and developed this special Conference—Dr. Daniel E. Marvin, Jr.

Dan is currently the Director of the State of Virginia Council of Higher Education. However, on February 15 he will become the President of Eastern Illinois University. The Council is proud and happy for Dan in his new assignment, but he still has one for us this morning, and that is to tell you about the purpose and thrust of this Conference.)

Thank you, Armand.

And welcome, ladies and gentlemen, to the Invitational Conference on Continuing Education, Manpower Policy, and Lifelong Learning.

Our Council is advisory. Clearly and simply, the Council's major purpose is to advise the President and the Congress on policies, issues, and regulations affecting the Federal Government's involvement in extension and continuing education. In that regard, the Council has been gratified by the number of its recommendations which have been enacted into law.

Without pausing to define what either the Congress or we mean by extension and continuing education, since neither term lends itself to a crisp definition, let me give you a few examples of the Council's interests.

First and foremost, we are concerned about the Federal Government's literally hundreds of educational programs, most of which touch in part on areas that provide the theme for this Conference.

These programs have been authorized by over

70 committees and subcommittees of the Congress. They are administered by virtually every agency of the Federal Government. Three out of four of these programs fall outside the direct jurisdiction of the U.S. Commissioner of Education and the Assistant Secretary of Education, who are the chief education officers of the Federal Government.

We are concerned about the nation's post-secondary institutions and their ability to respond to Federal initiatives and to maintain the Federal-university partnership that has been so beneficial to our society.

We are concerned that these institutions be able to develop and extend their resources to meet the needs of individuals and communities, and to respond through their public service activities to the broad social needs of the nation. We are anxious that they respond appropriately and that they respond with conviction.

We are concerned that postsecondary institutions continue to do what they do best, which is to *teach*. But we are especially concerned that they are able to teach and to train those who either want or need that training, with minimal encumbrances — *wherever* it is needed, *whenever* it is needed, *however* it is needed, and by *whomever* it is needed.

We are concerned about non-traditional students. We know, for instance, that the average student today is no longer your full-time resident student between the ages of 18 and 22, set on earning a degree, but is more likely to be a part-time student who is older, probably working, and carrying extra family and work responsibilities.

We are concerned about equal educational

opportunities for adults — not only that barriers to more and better adult learning in the United States come down, but that support for adult learning increases, especially at the Federal level of government.

We are concerned about the dramatic enrollment changes taking place in our institutions, and the more emotional changes taking place in these institutions' sense of mission and their sense of public service.

We are also concerned that the average American worker today has already received 12 or more years of formal education, and that these workers and their families, numbering in the millions, are now at the threshold of the nation's colleges and universities.

We are concerned that major and not-so-major business enterprises are spending billions of dollars in the private sector on education and training for their internal purposes, and that many of these have established elaborate and successful facilities and programs of their own.

We are concerned that organized labor is significantly becoming more involved in seeking educational and learning opportunities for their constituents, and that labor-management negotiated education benefits are increasing, but are sadly underutilized.

The Council is aware that what is happening in government, in business and industry, in labor, and in postsecondary education are all legitimate responses to the learning needs of the American adult population, but that too often what each is doing bears little relationship to what the others are doing.

We are concerned that the primary parties supporting adult learning in the United States — in short, the organizations and the people you represent at this Conference — do not fully understand each other, that we do not always succeed in communicating to each other what our own needs are. We do not always know how to help each other.

This understanding and communication is vital. All the evidence that the Council has been able to accumulate indicates that the learning needs of the adult population are escalating and are reflected at every level of our society.

All of you in this room respond to that need in one fashion or another. If this Conference achieves nothing else but to expand our understanding and trust of each other, and what each of us perceives to be some of the underlying issues and priorities, then the Conference will be partially justified.

There seems to be little question but that the learning which adults are seeking somehow relates to their working life. Most of their needs are job or career-related. They involve education and training to get a job, to hold on to a job, or to seek a better job.

But that is not all there is to it. Individuals have complex personal, family, and civic responsibilities that are as valid as their working responsibilities. These responsibilities also generate a lively interest in continuing education and lifelong learning. Meeting these needs can change us all as a people and, I believe, make us better as a people.

But who is to determine these needs? As great as our resources are in both the private and public sectors, these resources are nonetheless *limited*. What are the learning needs to which we *must* respond? And which of us can best respond to them? What kinds of training and education does the private sector do best? What kinds are best done in the public sector? Who is to pay the tremendous and formidable costs of providing this training, and what incentives are needed to encourage and stimulate the fullest possible response to these learning needs?

It is this question of *responsiveness* to national needs which, perhaps more than any other question, initially engaged the concern of the Council and which led to the planning of this Conference.

If we are talking about learning opportunities for the American adult population, then we are indeed talking in the broadest possible terms. We are talking of things that surmount the special interests which each of us may have. We are speaking in terms which cry out for some better sense of national purpose and direction.

It is not simply a question of what the Federal Government does or does not do. Nor is it a question of what institutions do or do not do.

Those of you in business and industry, those of you in organized labor, those of you who represent the education and training interests of employers and employees and their families, are all directly involved in this as well.

If we can achieve at the national level a better sense of direction and purpose on the matter of adult learning in the United States, then we will all benefit. If we cannot achieve this, then most assuredly we will all suffer.

Many of you in this room perceive continuing education, manpower development, and lifelong learning in terms of productivity. Some of you

perceive them in terms of improving the quality of working life, or of achieving important national goals, or as a legal or professional responsibility.

Regardless of how they are perceived, they are *there*. They are there in such magnitude of numbers and dollars — with such great potential to our society — that they are truly a matter of national concern. To consider them as anything less would be a disservice to ourselves as a free and thinking people.

You have all received a copy of the scope of work statement that was prepared for this Conference. It is brief, but it is precise and thoughtful. Among the many questions raised by it, there is one in particular that I wish to draw your attention to, which is: *that the United States, unlike most other developed nations, does not have at its disposal an instrument, a forum, through which the primary parties concerned with adult learning can meet and discuss the nation's agenda of priorities.*

We have no such forum, no such central body, where matters of such importance can be discussed deliberately and with authority.

The Council does not believe that this Conference is a solution to that dilemma. This Conference is our recognition of the problem and the need. We strongly believe that this Conference is a worthwhile undertaking and is supportive of

other recent efforts to open up the dialogue between the world of work and the world of education.

The Council would like your help. We are seeking it in the areas that concern us and which represent the theme of this Conference. We feel that we do not now have the kinds of Federal or national policies that respond to your needs and to the needs of the people you serve.

We feel that postsecondary institutions do not fully understand the concerns of business and labor, and that business and labor do not fully understand the problems of our institutions. We feel that the Federal Government does not listen with a whole ear or respond with a clear enough voice to what is being demonstrated in every community and in the workplaces of America, or that labor and business organizations and the educational community have ever united on any issue that would leave its impact upon Washington.

Perhaps such an alliance is beyond our reach. But if it is, we should try to find out why. And if such an alliance is not beyond our reach, the only way we will ever know this is when we are able to identify the issue or issues that bring us together.

I am suggesting to you that the themes of this Conference are those issues.

Introducing Mr. J. C. Turner

Dr. Hunter:

Thank you, Dan, and now I have the honor and the very great pleasure of introducing the first of our major speakers for this Conference, Mr. J. C. Turner, General President of the International Union of Operating Engineers, who will make a statement representing labor on the issues of our concern.

Mr. Turner was born in Texas, but received both his high school and college education in Washington, D.C. at Eastern High School and Catholic University. He has completed graduate work in economics at both Catholic and American Universities.

His involvement in labor and union activities started in 1934 with Local 77 of the IUOE, and his official duties and services with the International Union have ranged, over the period of time from that date to the present, from Business Manager of Local 77 in Washington, D.C., to Assistant to the General President, International Vice President, General Secretary-Treasurer, and the present highest office of General President.

The list of Mr. Turner's services to the labor movement is both distinguished and extensive,

covering local, national, and international appointments and assignments. And his public service activities and contributions have been equally as distinguished and extensive, ranging from membership on the District of Columbia City Council to a long list of official positions with national organizations and associations and to current membership on the Board of Trustees of the Catholic University of America.

Mr. Turner has been honored for his services and contributions with many distinguished awards, the latest of which was the Whitney M. Young, Jr. Memorial Award for Outstanding Service to the Community and the Nation, presented by the Urban League. Certainly his years of dedicated service to labor, the public, and to his union, his experience in the worlds of work and of education, and his deep personal concern for the learning needs of our society uniquely qualify him to speak to us on behalf of labor on the subject of this meeting.

I am pleased and honored to present Mr. J. C. Turner, General President of the International Union of Operating Engineers.

Labor and Continuing Education

Mr. J. C. Turner

General President, International Union of
Operating Engineers



The alliance between labor and education is of long duration. It was organized labor that fought in the last century to make free public education available to all as a matter of right. And labor remains the most consistent and effective champion of public funds for education.

We speak primarily for our consumer interest in education. There are some 20 million organized workers in this country, and 14.2 million of these belong to AFL-CIO affiliated unions.

When one uses the term trade union member and his or her family, we attach a multiplier of four to that and arrive at the astonishing figure of 80 million union-associated Americans who have a stake in the American system of education at all levels. Much of what we say in the Congress, the State legislatures, and the local school boards has its basis in the consumer concept.

And so part of the responsibility of the AFL-CIO, together with the non-affiliated unions in America, is to work for progress in this field and to join with our natural allies in the education community to realize mutual goals.

Abraham Lincoln recognized this in discussing labor and education many years ago. He said:

"By the mud-sill theory, it is assumed that labor and education are incompatible, and any practical combination of them impossible. According to that theory, the education of laborers is not only useless but pernicious and dangerous. Free labor, on the other hand, demands universal education and they have much the better of the argument."

Even in those early years, labor did not think of education as the exclusive province of the young.

Leaders of the Workingmen's Party asked rhetorically, "Is it to be said that the welfare of the adults themselves is second in importance to the right of education of their offspring?"

Today Americans face enormous problems in this nation and in the world around us: the technology of the future and its implications, the energy crisis, the raw materials issues, the multinational corporations, scarcities, and the demands of the Third World for economic justice. We could sweep these problems under the rug and ignore them, but only at our own peril. The American people will be deeply involved in the making of public policy in the future on precisely these issues — and the quality of their involvement will depend upon the contribution that adult educators are prepared to make. This, it seems to me, is a major challenge to this group.

The technology of the '80s and '90s will be devastating to many occupations now enjoying a level of stability. Experiments which will change the nature of jobs and work are taking place in interplanetary space, under the sea, in nuclear and biological laboratories, and in the workplace itself.

There are revolutionary new advances in the communications field. Frankly, some frighten us. There is *in place* right now — not on the drawing board — a device which can attach to your television set whereby I can write to you in California from, say, New York, and my letter will appear on your screen and you may get a printout at the bottom with the privacy of that communication protected. By the 1990's, we are told, it will be economically feasible for anyone. Our gut reaction to that is — what happens to some 400,000 postal workers and letter carriers?

There is a relatively long list of occupations which will be affected by this sort of thing.

Here is where we find justification for adopting the concept of lifelong learning. There is no question that adults will *need and depend* for economic survival upon the opportunity to recycle.

Adults education planners need to stay abreast of these developments at the local, regional, and national levels. Although it will be difficult to project needs with a high degree of accuracy, it should be possible to identify trends and develop programs which stress basic skills and adaptation, so that students get a head start on the road to acquiring new skills. Perhaps there will be lessons to learn from our current debate over the conversion to the metric system.

Every day more and more Americans are exposed to some aspect of the metric system. On December 23, 1975, President Ford signed the Metric Conversion Act of 1975. The act recognizes that metric conversion is an unresolved major national issue, responds to its increasing use, and provides the mechanism for public participation in the decision-making process. Every U.S. citizen must fully understand exactly what is involved in converting a \$1.5 trillion economy to the metric system.

Organized labor's quest for an objective investigation and its persistence in calling for a practical response to the increasing use of metric measurement are frequently misinterpreted, and thus it is important to stress that the AFL-CIO is not opposed to metrification. It stresses the need for flexibility and programs which provide the necessary assistance to those adversely affected by metrification.

We in labor tend to concern ourselves with the postsecondary area of adult education, although you can expect strong legislative support from us for basic education, too. Our policy at the post-secondary level has been consistent — both in content and degree of success. We have always looked for a lot, and have always found very little.

Some 30 years ago, as a Vice President of the Greater Washington Central Labor Union, I assisted in drafting proposed legislation that would have created a National Labor Education Extension Act. My recollection of the Morrill Act of 1862, the bedrock legislation for public postsecondary education, is that it was "to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts . . . in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes. . . ."

During the century or so since the state colleges began their steady growth, I have to assume that the ivy has grown over the words "mechanic arts" because, while the Agricultural Extension Service exists as model of continuing education, not a penny of Federal money has been appropriated for labor extension education.

A labor extension education program operated through the state university system could have as great a benefit for America's workers — the industrial classes — as the Agricultural Extension Service has had for farmers. I request your consideration of this during your deliberations.

There is a new development occurring in the labor movement which has great potential for this body. I refer to the education tuition refund clauses that are appearing in collective bargaining agreements. Union members in auto, electrical, and a variety of industries now have benefits that defray education expenses. The recent UAW/Ford agreement provided for up to \$950 a year to employees who wish to advance their education. There is a hooker, however. Courses taken must be job-related — an IRS requirement. We, of course, are pressing for the elimination of this rule.

While on this point, I must point out that such benefits are grossly underutilized for no apparent reason. A study by the National Manpower Institute, now underway, will hopefully point to the causes of this phenomenon. If it can tell us how to get adults back to the classroom, that alone will serve our mutual interests.

My own International Union of Operating Engineers some five years ago initiated a research and demonstration program that investigated the proposition that our union's apprenticeship program, both in its trade theory classes and its on-the-job practicum, had academic value. Today almost half of our 5,600 apprentices are receiving college credit for their apprenticeship, and when this credit is coupled with courses in general studies, they receive an Associate in Science degree at the same time they receive their journeyman's union card.

We would like to see further studies on how adults learn — a constant problem for us in labor education programs. Students in our staff training centers are from diverse backgrounds and various levels of educational experience.

I want to emphasize that labor's interest in continuing education goes far beyond mere skill training. Education has three distinct dimensions:

- 1) Education for work,

- 2) Education for life, and
- 3) Education for public service.

We are concerned that our members be able to make sound decisions as citizens of their community, their nation, and their world. We are concerned that they be able to make creative use of their leisure time and of their retirement years. We are concerned that as consumers they be able to spend their earnings wisely. And especially we are concerned that each of them be able to fulfill the best that is in himself or herself.

To this end, organized labor itself is engaged in what may well be the largest continuing education program in the nation. In a four year period, something like 100,000 union members have participated in the programs conducted by the AFL-CIO Education Department, the education departments of the individual unions, and the labor extension centers which have been established by 41 major universities.

During the past decade, the AFL-CIO established its own center for labor studies, the George Meany Center for Labor Studies, in the metropolitan Washington area. Here, staff and officers of our affiliated unions from around the nation gather to learn about the latest information regarding the law, collective bargaining, advanced economic developments, and a variety of other subjects. In collaboration with Antioch College of Ohio, we also offer an external baccalaureate degree in labor studies covering these subjects. The Center's

Gallery Lounge houses exhibits of the visual arts. At the present time — by odd coincidence — an exhibition of paintings by George Meany is being featured. A 200 seat theater is the center of free Wednesday night entertainment ranging from Dixieland Jazz to chamber music.

There are many other examples which I might mention — the degree program which the New York Central Labor Body makes available to its members; the Seafarers Union's Harry Lundeberg School in Piney Point, Maryland, where youths study to become seafarers and where seasoned seafarers can come to update and upgrade their skills; and many other exciting programs.

Organized labor is thus very active in conducting its own forms of continuing education.

But in the final analysis, the growth of continuing education will require the support of public funding. We are happy, as I presume all of you are, that the 1976 amendments to the Higher Education Act include a new provision in Title I which does provide Federal funding of continuing education. This plus the leadership of the Carter administration promise a bright future for lifelong learning.

We look forward with enthusiasm toward the future development of continuing education and toward our own participation in that development. This is our promise and it is America's promise — to permit all people to become all that they are capable of becoming.

Introducing Mr. Charles L. Brown, Jr.

Dr. Hunter:

Thank you Mr. Turner, and now I have the honor and very great pleasure to introduce the second of our major speakers, Mr. Charles L. Brown, Jr., Vice Chairman of the Board and Chief Financial Officer of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company, who will make a statement representing business and industry.

Mr. Brown was born in Virginia and received his education in that State, graduating from the University of Virginia with a Bachelor of Science degree in electrical engineering. He later switched to the University of Pennsylvania for some additional special work at the Institute of Humanistic Studies for Executives.

He began his professional career with the Bell System in 1946, starting with the AT&T-Long Lines Division. Over the period of years, Mr. Brown has progressively moved upward in both technical/professional and managerial assignments, and around and about in terms of location. He has covered a full range of jobs — from equipment maintenance to area General Manager to a State system company president to his present high office at AT&T of Vice Chairman

of the Board and Chief Financial Officer. He has also worked in a full range of locations — from Connecticut to Ohio, Georgia, Pennsylvania, Missouri, Illinois, and New York.

Mr. Brown's professional, educational, and public services and affiliations also are very distinguished and extensive. He is a member of a number of honorary fraternities and societies; a trustee of several leading universities, including the University of Chicago; an appointee to a number of Federal and national commissions and councils; and he has held a long list of offices and assignments with professional, educational, public, and business organizations, agencies, and associations, with responsibilities ranging from local volunteer activities through State and national services to international corporate development.

His honors and awards, his years of dedicated service to industry, to education, to the public and to government certainly qualify him to speak to us on behalf of business and industry and the issues of our concern.

I am pleased and honored to present Mr. Charles L. Brown, Vice Chairman of the Board and Chief Financial Officer of AT&T.

Business and Continuing Education

Mr. Charles L. Brown, Jr.

Vice Chairman of the Board and

Chief Financial Officer, American

Telephone and Telegraph Company



The problem that you are facing and the interest that you have in it is inspiring, and I do not know of a situation in the United States today which deserves consolidated attention from more angles than this one does. Postsecondary education itself poses a lot of challenges, a lot of them difficult ones.

The Bell System is not without educational experience in its own field. We have a large number of people, and we need to keep them updated to keep the technology alive. We have probably the largest collection of PhD's in the world doing research work in our Bell Laboratories operations, and so we do have a close link with education. A good many of us in business are also trustees of universities. We have a large constituency which is very close to colleges and universities.

One of the problems of business, of course, is that nobody speaks for business. It just cannot be done. So, some of my colleagues in the audience may very well say, "Well, that goes for him, it doesn't go for me." And that is, of course, one of the problems that you face. However, I will do my best to try to give you a broad picture of how business feels with respect to continuing education.

Of course, for a businessman, the first thing you want to think about in looking at this problem is — what is the outlook for jobs? What really is the outlook for jobs in the next few years? Then perhaps we can take a look at the relationship between jobs and education, and finally at the non-job aspects of education itself.

As for the outlook on jobs, I guess everybody here knows that forecasting itself is about as

difficult and hazardous an occupation as you can find. But the Labor Department has done a pretty good job. It has tackled the thing and has some statistics that perhaps we can start, if not finish, with.

The Labor Department has reached some conclusions which I think are worth considering. And, the numbers I will talk about cover the period from 1974 to 1985. First of all, it is fairly sure — and most business people do not disagree with this — that total employment is going to grow about 20 percent in that period. Although the trends in employment in white collar/blue collar service, farm employment, and so forth are expected to continue through the mid '80s, some very important changes are going to occur in the mix of one occupation versus another. As has been pointed out today by Mr. Turner, the technological changes which are going to occur will cause employment to increase in some occupations and decrease in others. He brushed off rather cavalierly what is going to happen to the telephone company when you can get a letter over your television set. I thought that was kind of cruel of him. But we shall manage to get along here somehow.

This threat of computers, of course, is a very significant point. And here in this huge complex of educational facilities for Xerox, you see a small indication of that very thing. The differences in industrial growth will boost some occupations and, of course, diminish some others.

The relationship between education and jobs that we are going to see inspired by the changes in the next 10 years has real significance to us when you look at the relationship between those

jobs requiring a college education and those which do not. The Labor Department's numbers show that those jobs traditionally requiring a college education are going to grow between 20 percent and 30 percent. Outstanding growth is projected for such major job categories as engineers, science technicians, medical workers, computer specialists, airplane pilots, air traffic controllers, and radio operators. Job opportunities for bank officials, architects, financial managers — which I'm pleased to hear — and lawyers — which I am sorry to hear — and recreation and social workers, are all expected to increase by more than 40 percent in this period.

Retirements and deaths, of course, are really going to have something to do with job openings as they occur. As a matter of fact, the expectation is that twice the number of openings will occur by retirements and deaths as will occur by growth in these jobs. Now this means, of course, that a good many of those jobs are going to be filled by individuals who have already gotten their education, so to speak, and who are constantly working in the general area of the jobs they will pick up, and have already gotten on-the-job training.

Thus, I think it is fair to say that there may be less need for specialized training for these job openings that I am speaking of, than if all the work had to be done from scratch, from the standpoint of training.

The Labor Department estimated that some 12 million of these jobs are going to open up in the period of 1974 to 1985. In addition to those two sources we spoke about — employment growth and replacement — there are a couple of other factors at work here. First, you are going to find a need for job upgrading and knowledge of the oncoming job as technology changes. And you are going to find, therefore, a need for better training in specialized fields. The flip side of that coin, however, is that people may very well be taking jobs for which they are overtrained.

As far as hiring people for jobs for which they are overtrained, you have to think a little bit about the employer rationale. If, in fact, there is going to be a surplus of college graduates, which we have to face at this point, the employer is going to put a college graduate in a job which may not traditionally, in the past, have required that. He is going to find this to be a good thing to do, because it will give the employee a greater potential on the job to see what the job contains. It will also provide a broader perspective for the job itself, and perhaps it will be carried out better. Of course, job frustration may also become involved, which is

entirely another subject.

What about the surplus of college graduates? What about this supply/demand situation? The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has already forecast that during this period, colleges will turn out some 16 million graduates, 13 million of whom will look for jobs in the civilian labor force. With 12 million openings and 13 million applicants, we have a million graduates who will have to find jobs that do not require a college education. Most of this oversupply is going to be in the humanities and the liberal arts and the teacher-oriented occupations.

We talked a little bit about the relationship between earnings of college graduates versus the earnings of others. Although a lifetime earning advantage still exists for college graduates, it is diminishing, and compared to the salaries and pay of electricians and plumbers and others, some college graduates actually find out that they are not doing as well. The increases in earnings by crafts people and technicians have led a growing number of people to wonder whether or not there is a direct connection any more between college education and high salaries. Perhaps the two do not necessarily go together.

The oversupply of college graduates is going to have perhaps two other effects. It is going to increase competition for non-college jobs — the jobs which are traditionally non-college, and it may stimulate non-college-educated job seekers to upgrade their own education in order to compete better and in order to specialize.

But it surely will not have the effect of easing the problem of overcapacity in the educational system. To anticipate the demand for post-secondary specialized education, it might be advocated that the capacities of two year colleges should be expanded. This, however, really does not appeal to me. If the two year colleges and the educational system in general now have an overcapacity, it does not seem to make a whole lot of sense to expand the capacity of any one segment. One alternative would be to let the market cause a cutback in the production of college graduates. This would be a wasteful solution, I do not have any doubt. And it probably would have some very destructive consequences for an educational system which we should and are all proud of.

Another alternative would be to look for constructive ways to keep this educational system useful and operating effectively. One way would be to look for ways to increase the demand side of the supply/demand equation. Instead of

continuing to produce college graduates who cannot find jobs, perhaps the emphasis needs to be on increasing the demand for education.

There are already efforts which suggest ways to attack this problem. As Jay Turner pointed out, on a relatively small scale industry has, over the years, sponsored with unions tuition-aid programs for its employees. A 1970 study, which is being updated now by the Conference Board, shows that the median rate of use of these tuition-aid programs was about four percent. And, as Jay pointed out, it is hard to believe and hard to understand why it does not increase. Industry spent about \$17 million on these programs, and although the numbers are some five years old, when you adjust them to today's conditions, you do not find a very large amount of money. It is relatively small compared with the population we are talking about. In the Bell System alone, we spent \$7 million in 1975 on tuition-aid programs.

We are also experimenting at AT&T with company financed management training courses in collaboration with colleges and universities, and we find they are working to a degree. There are inhibiting factors, however, and we really do not think that large-scale growth is in the cards. And so it comes back to what was said a while ago: the primary purpose of most tuition-aid programs is to combat job knowledge deficiencies. Even if we assume that projected job growth and job changes will generate some increased interest, it is hard to believe that tuition-aid in the next 10 years is going to solve, or partially solve, the problem of making education available to those who really need it or of the overcapacity in the educational system itself.

Programs offering non-job-related education are another subject, and certainly need to be looked at. One thing which we have found of some value is the changing tendency of university and college people to insist that students come to the campus. We find that there is some inclination to come directly to the work site, and this perhaps offers us something which we have not widely explored before. This might solve part of the problem of the low take on tuition-aid programs. Where no special equipment is required, why not? Why not extend education to the work site? The collaboration of unions and companies and colleges in this way seems to offer some opportunity, although we have only touched on it.

Providing courses for personal growth and the pursuit of happiness, if you will, without reference to earning a living, offers perhaps one important way of being able to use the overcapacity that we

are all concerned about. Increasing leisure time is going to bring about more interest in continuing education for non-vocational reasons.

A significant increase in enrollment for these sorts of reasons is going to require several things. Not the least of which, I think, is an understanding, as Jay mentioned, of why people do not go to school in the first place, and secondly, what is necessary to attract them to school.

We need to surmount what Dan Marvin pointed out, and that is for a long time in this country people have regarded education as a preparation for work, rather than as a preparation for times of leisure. In the minds of most people, even with humanities courses, there is somehow a connection between the ability of the individual to earn a living and his education. The purpose of education is to qualify one for work, surely, but on the other hand there are useful occupations which can certainly profit and should benefit by the expansion of the mind with respect to what is happening in business and outside business and in the civic arena. It will not be easy to get people to view this matter otherwise. But I think it is essential to do so.

The business community may very well be able to help in this by encouraging more use of tuition-aid, and perhaps government can give a hand here by the use of incentives for students to go to school. Getting additional employees to go to school or having their companies pay for it or urging them to do so do not appeal to me unless there is some incentive for the individual himself. And perhaps such a change — that is, in individual incentive — will give some stimulus to the demand, and that is very necessary.

To a businessman it seems obvious that the answer to the problems that we have discussed does not lie in the continuing overproduction of college graduates along the same line that has been in progress. Nor does it lie in expanding facilities in education today, until we learn how to use those which we have. And there is increasing evidence that students will not enroll anyway, unless incentives are devised. We need innovative ways to use these valuable resources that we have in the existing educational establishment.

In summary, there is a surplus of college graduates now, and that is the prospect for the next 10 years. The nature of the job market is such that specialized training is going to be more in demand. Business will have a buyers' market and will be inclined to hire the top of the quality heap. Some graduates are going to find themselves in jobs for which they are

overqualified. There are some alternatives to wasting the existing overcapacity in the educational system, and business can help in some ways, if incentives are provided for the individual students to go for self-development. I share with you the hope and the expectation that

meetings such as this will introduce productive kinds of solutions for the use of our most valuable national asset — the postsecondary educational system.

Thank you very much.

Introducing Dr. Paul A. Miller

Dr. Hunter:

I now have the honor and special pleasure of introducing a longtime and very good personal friend, a former colleague and "boss," and the third of our major speakers — Dr. Paul A. Miller, President of the Rochester Institute of Technology (RIT), who will give us the statement representing education and its involvement and concern in the issues of our Conference.

Dr. Miller was born in Ohio but spent most of his early life and received his education in West Virginia, earning his Bachelor of Science degree from West Virginia University. He began his professional career with the University's Agricultural Extension Service, interrupted it with service in the U.S. Army Air Force during World War II, and then resumed his education with graduate studies leading to a PhD at Michigan State University (MSU). Paul moved quickly through the ranks at MSU, becoming a full professor in sociology and anthropology, and then, as often happens to distinguished professors, he was appointed to the university administration — first as Director of the Agricultural Extension Service and then as Vice President and Provost.

Dr. Miller left MSU in 1961 to serve as President of his alma mater, West Virginia University. Then in 1966 he was appointed by President Johnson to the position of Assistant

Secretary for Education in the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. He handled a number of special projects and programs in this assignment. At the end of his Federal service he became Distinguished Professor of Education and Director of University Planning Studies at the University of North Carolina. Paul was back in the field of teaching, research, and "professing" again. But once more the call and the challenge of university administration returned him from the ranks of teaching to his present administrative assignment as President of RIT.

Dr. Miller is a man with his roots in the good earth which sustains us, and with his heart in the educational interests and needs of the people. He has served on many Presidential, national, and international commissions and studies. He has been active in the problems of food production and nutrition in the developing nations, and in the building of their higher educational institutions. And he has served in the highest offices of our national educational associations. His past experience and services and his present leadership of one of our nation's leading private technical and professional universities uniquely qualify him to speak on behalf of education to the subject of this Conference.

I am pleased and honored to present my former colleague and ever friend, Dr. Paul A. Miller, President, the Rochester Institute of Technology.

Educational Practice and Industrial Custom

Dr. Paul A. Miller
President, Rochester Institute of Technology



Karl Mannheim, perceptive student of social change, once wrote of society's *Principia Media*. He meant those institutions or functions capable of special leverage in complex society. Mannheim believed that once these levers are identified, their skillful use brings constructive change. Mannheim's interest in the *Principia Media* of society might serve as the text of this Conference. May we ourselves not think of education and work as among the principal levers of American society?

We assemble to study how learning relates to people at work, especially with regard to learning as a permanent part of life. Thus my remarks include thoughts about educational practice and industrial custom; they call in part for better interface between education and industry; and in part they reflect upon what this interface holds for the sources of a primary citizenship. The social distance between work, education, and family points to a subjective failure of modern society to think socially as it acts technologically.¹

We gather also to consider how effective we can make the instrument of continuing education, for now it has come into its own as a continuous thread to life, and, as it relates to work and leisure, becomes part of the *Principia Media*, capable of contributing to restorative change. The concept of continuous learning has been growing for a long time, as the purpose of education has swung inexorably from personal to social aims and, more recently, has turned back the other way.

Higher education has always felt the tension between knowledge viewed as an end in itself and knowledge viewed as the solution to social problems. This tension is expressed in the

debates about general and specific studies, between whether to celebrate the head or the hand, and between the purely intellectual and the practical. In this century, especially, the pendulum has kept moving to the side of the social aim. Interest has grown in relating access to education with the method of production and, later, to the characteristics of consumption. Colleges came to sort and to credential human talent, a process that has sped onward with the democratization of culture.²

Thus there has been placed in motion a process that gave rise to modernism in the first third of the twentieth century in the arts, literature, and science. By the middle third of the century mass education was serving to democratize this modernism and disseminate it throughout the common culture. The final third of the century looms as a time of confusion in the reform of education, especially in the conflict between the rational use of knowledge and the new resistance to the modernism which such knowledge has been dispersed to achieve.³

In the bargain, the high prestige which investment in education has enjoyed has declined and has been swept into the clouded nature of material advance and its unexpected outcomes. Education seems strained between the need to respond to new realities and its desire to embody an active culture as the nation tries to rediscover its cultural ethical identity. In the short of it, the meaning which people now begin to attach to education more, strongly swings to ends that would justify it in terms of personal realization or fulfillment. Changes in new directions gather force. Non-traditional forms weaken the old

monopolies of schools and colleges. And industry itself becomes more educational in outlook.

Such swings have come to benefit adult education. Moreover, the number of conventional students is leveling off and will eventually go down, in some regions by as much as one-third. Meanwhile, part-time adult learners, notwithstanding the decline of such students on campuses in the past year, are rising in numbers, at least double the conventional rate.

So there is dimly to be seen a kind of break-up going on of the long pull of education into the service of society:

- more attention is paid to self-learning;
- the idea takes hold that education is to be properly stretched over the whole of life; and
- more interest is given to linking the school with the family and the community.

Meanwhile, educators exhibit more humble beliefs:

- their institutions cannot be all things to all people, no instant cure for the illnesses of society;
- the value of a person, of an education, of a worker, cannot be measured any longer by a piece of paper, whether a grade, a diploma, or a degree; and
- schools and colleges must prove that they are willing to do the best job possible for the least cost.

Thus, perhaps even more dimly seen, a new vision arises of where and how learning occurs — that place where learners of all ages and interests may draw upon the resources of the whole community; where people learn and work at the same time; where talented citizens may teach or learn; and where isolated buildings no longer multiply but give way to libraries, industrial shops, media, art centers, and, in time, each home and office.

Both education and industry seem immersed in the cause and the result of these shifts. Each is called on to perform better. Educators confront a skepticism that too many people go to college and that frustrating underemployment eventually will dull human aspiration. Industry is told that the work ethic is in doubt, that indeed, as it is said, there is a contradiction built into capitalism — that the consuming spirit that it needs will lead to hedonism, pleasure as its own end, resulting in the decay of interest in production.⁴

Both education and industry confront an update

of the criticism once levelled at the Industrial Revolution, when the factory system was damned for either destroying traditional values or for alienating and dehumanizing workers. In recent years, a new critique has risen to charge that technological society shapes and eventually dominates the institutions of life according to its own ends, among them education and industry. This new critique frequently criticizes what it holds is the destruction of the natural environment, or it may score the decline in freedom for people to live varied lifestyles, to take part in designing one's job, and to make changes in careers and other patterns of life along and within the stages of the adult life cycle.⁵

Whatever one thinks of this modern critique, surely it suggests that the connection of education to work itself must be carefully examined. It will have us trace how the idea of work for personal achievement with production as its end gave way eventually to work in the interest of personal consumption and possession and, further, how a third era has appeared in which work is argued as a prime source of personal enjoyment and fulfillment.⁶ To be noted also is the increase in rights or entitlements which people have come to expect in a society of great affluence and high technology — to a job that gives satisfaction, to participate in the decisions that affect that job, to a secure old age, to health care, and to lifelong education.⁷ And here and there people challenge the very technique of work by alleging that efficiency is exploitive. Thus the basis of self-discipline, objectivity, and rationality is being called into question, along with industrial and governmental systems, management, and science.⁸

Such is part of the challenge now being made to core American values, one that influences what leaders of labor, management, and colleges do. Each needs to be closer to the others if a new model of collaboration is to displace the muted *quid pro quo* relationship that now governs — the colleges trading credentialled manpower in return for financial and, occasionally, ideological support. Unfortunately, industry's suspicion of the academy's necessary modes of criticism, and the tendency of educators to cloister themselves from frontline realities, foster a cool and distanced relationship. It is a relationship that is often unable to solve the mutual problem of communicative and economic illiteracy and surely unable to permit thinking together about the lifetime development of working people.

A new model is needed to bring education and

industry to common effort. The human relations school tried to keep workers happy, but it cared little for their personal development.⁹ Scientific management emphasized still another mode — specialize, routinize, simplify tasks, and assign creative management to others. But the cultural level of the times finds workers saying: "I am an individual. I want to grow, contribute, and enjoy — not one at a time, but at the same time, all the time." If, as it seems true, the machinery or structure of society (which defines the roles people play) is at odds with the culture (or those beliefs about what those roles ought to be), then both education and industry critically need to reform their relationship.

A new interface between educators and the leaders of industrial labor and management must look to updating concepts of mutual interest. The guides are numerous, and for this or a similar conference one needs only to cite some recently classic views: Willard Wirtz's *The Boundless Resource*, James O'Toole's *Work in America*, and James Coleman's *Youth: Transition to Adulthood*. One learns from these authors and their associates that, while rapid technical change is highly relished and equated with progress, consequent adjustments in the very concepts of social life are ignored and even buried under layers of personal discontent.

Thus education and industry must look forward to a new baseline of understanding. For example:

- Learning, working, and leisuring must come to be interwoven as concurrent functions for the whole of a lifetime;
- The meaning of leisure must be revised as one's true work, which may or may not be the same as one's job, rather than defined as an escape in order to repair one's self for that job;¹⁰
- Credentials must be changed to mean demonstrated performance of specific competence rather than paper proof that the holder has run the track or served his sentence;
- People must grow more free to choose and shape their lives — to switch between income-producing jobs, education, and leisure — with attendant reforms in the patterns of working time, education, training, vacation, and pension systems; and
- Both education and industry must start teaching the human rather than the market value of learning, both on and off the job.¹¹

Why is such an update so important? Because it

deals with the sources of primary citizenship in America — families, the work people do, and the places where they learn. Family, school, and work: for most of history they overlapped! Their covenant helped youth to experience what the world was like and gradually, as youth were ready, to be released into it. But alas, these institutions have fallen apart! At times they seem not to care for each other, tending even to be adversaries. The family is left alone to manage emotions, often collapsing from the weight of the draft for love upon it. The school resembles an age-graded ghetto, extending social adolescence for the young even as their physical adolescence grows shorter. And the worker no longer experiences the whole product of his labor; he can only imagine it.

Surely one process, if no other, deserves the word "crisis" in America, and that is the drying up of the root sources of primary citizenship, for the family and the school and one's work are no longer able to interpret the real community to the young. Is it any wonder that so much of the output of material progress is absorbed right back into the chaos of social and emotional life?

This crisis does not respond easily to sudden explosions of national policy and program; indeed, part of the problem itself is the confusion of governmental, industrial, and academic macro-systems, which not only defy direction by their vastness but also dominate and exhaust the microcosmic institutions upon which the nature of a primary citizenship so fully depends. To be sure, new macro-projects must be accomplished, but first there are present tasks which can be done better:

- We can keep working to augment a diverse system of continuing education, now teaching at least 30 million adults, a system that is in place and here to stay. *Example:* widen the field beyond its modern emphasis upon the aims of the middle class.
- Educators might think less of their own convenience and more of that of their students. *Example:* restore the tie between classroom, work, and counselling.
- Labor and management leaders might broaden their idea of education as providing specific skills for narrow tasks. *Example:* sympathize and support the desire of workers to plan and achieve personal and family aspirations.
- Education and industry might work together to improve the nature and use of work/

study instruments now present. *Example:* obtain more and flexible use of tuition refunds beyond the fraction now used of the amount now available in contracts and otherwise, especially for blue collar workers.¹²

- Educators might devise new survey techniques in order to measure better how people and jobs fit, the future structure of employment, and the relation of education to job success. *Example:* learn how to measure who the students are and what they study in the diverse fields which make up lifelong continuing education.
- Leaders of education and industry might themselves engage in forms of cooperative education and work/study. *Example:* help educators understand the some-\$40 billion training system of industry, and help industrialists expand the educative environment of the industrial plant.¹³
- Work together to broaden current legislation and use better what is now available. *Example:* secure increases in funding for Title I and its new Part B for lifelong learning, for SEOG provisions, BEOG, Insured and Direct Student Loans, and work study legislation.

Thus may we recognize that continuing education gears itself to private aims and motivations: most people carry on learning projects beyond what is visible. Tackling human problems without helping people first understand their own situations is sure to fail. More than poverty or urban change or crime prevention, adult learning is too intimate and local a process for it to succumb quickly to corrective influence from on high, no matter how authoritative.¹⁴

But this does not say that we should fail to aspire to broad reform. Surely a full vision of the learning society requires good organizations as much or more than it does large infusions of money. Further, continuing education must not stand alone: it is but part of an overview of what learning has come to mean. Accordingly, what might be the shape of this broader vision or pattern of reform?

First, there is rising demand for a clearer reasoning of American educational purpose, a desire to overcome a pyramid of knotty disappointments: the incompleteness of education as a distributor of equity; the enigma of diverse institutions which nevertheless offer a dismaying uniformity of educational practice; the startling conclusion that a fifth to a third of American adults

receive low proficiency ratings in basic adult skills; the troublesome imbalance which continues between educational output and market demand; and the lack of zest and the sense of confinement which describe too much of the student attitude about education. Must we not, therefore, have a more accountable center, like a full Department of Education, and give it the stewardship of a policy for investing in a diverse and dispersed system of lifelong human development?

Second, lifelong education means alternating periods of learning with work and creative leisure. It will require eventually some new inventions — well-thought out entitlements throughout the lifespan, new flexible views of retirement, drawing rights upon employee insurance and security systems, and incentives to workers and employers alike for counter-cyclical investments in human resource development.¹⁵

Third, in order to orient the whole of education to urban life, some form of a metropolitan educational agency is in order. A collaborative framework, which relates work and education, should bring academics serving the lower schools together with industry and other learning and human services.¹⁷ No single step would better implant the genius of agricultural extension in cities than for higher education, industry, and service institutions to see the urban school, as rural extension saw the farm family, as the eye of the needle.

Fourth, such broad reforms, advocated now by an enormous literature in the work field and in higher education, and initially underway at home and abroad, suggest consideration of an event on the order of a White House Conference on Lifelong Learning and Primary Citizenship. Is there a subject more important for the third century of America? Is there a subject with ideas so advanced and practice so limited? Is there a subject to which education and industry can better rally?

Dreams perhaps! Even so, even if they are not yet attainable, we may still ask: is there any reason that we should wait to act when we return home?

- We can say it is wrong to build up work as the central measure of self-esteem, to create a culture based on the spiritual nature of work, and to indenture a whole way of life to it, then withhold work from at least a tenth of the people.¹⁸
- We can act on the worsening chances of unemployed youth in the cities, mourn their loss of a primary citizenship, and toil to

change those policies that serve the already employed, learning anew that to have people desire more education, they must have the taste of it in the first place.

- We can cooperate to introduce work and service to American youth in their schools and by reactivating the idea of a National Youth Service Corps. Lifelong learning must surely begin in the transition to adulthood which properly should give an appreciation of real work, human cooperation, economy, and enterprise.
- We can work to change the meaning and the policies that affect retirement, stop warehousing older people, get interested in the links between generations, and welcome these elder citizens in new ways to the campus, helping it become a vital staging ground from which they may go out to share mature service in the surrounding community.
- We can move to satisfy that poignant hunger of the many who search the corners of bookstalls in order to find a recipe for life, or turn to psychic escapes in order to find a mentoring spirit that was lost when friends and teachers, who once provided it, turned from listening to speaking of their own needs. Surely we can do better to help people — as when the life insurance agent or trust officer helps them make a plan in the event of death — to make a plan for the event of life.
- We can bring to the open table and talk about the not so latent tension today between life on the job and life in the family, exposing that not infrequent conflict between being a good worker and being a good parent at the same time, a conflict not alone in the underclasses where it is so fully documented, but found as well throughout the haunts of the affluent.

Such are some thoughts that sprang from but a glimmer of Mannheim's search for the *Principia Media*, those strategic levers of society. These thoughts hope for a new tripartite relationship among education, industry, and government. They expose genuine interest in restoring the sources of primary citizenship — the influence of a family which helps teach the best of productive enterprise, learning on and from one's job, finding a true work, and making the most of creative leisure.

The separation and thus the decay of these sources now threaten even those who lead the nation's macro-cosmic projects. Leaders too often ignore these sources. Failing to link their effort to the micro-cosmic projects of daily life, they

themselves become gripped by a machinery of government and regulation so vast that it has moved into the breach to maintain the psychic order, as such institutions as education and industry have become discredited by popular discontent.

To restore the health of the sources of primary citizenship is to assure that the human resource will adjust humanely when the natural resource has either satiated or deserted us. This is the great modern and fateful purpose of lifetime education, a purpose that will pursue every reform and every change and adjustment in social institutions.

The leaders of labor and management especially have the great task of encouraging people to fuse work and education as a lifelong union, and thus help youth experience more reality, those of middle age find more contentment at the interface of employment and family life, and older citizens find the identity that only the serving of others can bring. Alfred North Whitehead's ideal will then come fully true — that a great society is one in which men of business think greatly of their function.

And, finally, we who are educators must recognize that what we do with our own lives will speak more loudly than what we say or try to do with our programs. If we aim to promote continuous learning as an instrument for the fulfillment of an entire life, then we should be its best examples. If we believe that people should listen to their yearnings, then we should listen to our own. If we believe that learning, working, and leisuring should be intertwined, then we should risk them (and a life that binds them) for ourselves.

FOOTNOTES

- 1 Kurt Wolff, *From Karl Mannheim*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1971, p. 352
- 2 Eric Ashby, *Technology and the Academics*, MacMillan and Company, London, 1959, pp. 69-70
- 3 Christopher Lasch, "The Democratization of Culture," *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, Summer 1975
- 4 Daniel Bell, *The Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism*, Basic Books, Inc., New York, 1976

- 5 Edward Shorter, "Industrial Society in Trouble," *The American Scholar*, Spring 1971, pp. 330-348 (Karl Polanyi, Jacques Ellul, and Herbert Marcuse and, later, Norman Birnbaum, Alain Touraine, Lewis Mumford, and George Grant)
- 6 Amitai Etzioni, "The Search for Political Meaning," *The Center Magazine*, A Publication of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, March/April, 1972, pp. 2-11
- 7 Daniel Jankelevich, "Angry Workers, Happy Grads," *Psychology Today*, December 1974
- 8 Etzioni, *op.cit.*, p. 3
- 9 Stephen Ackroyd, "Sociological Theory and the Human Relation School," *Sociology of Work and Occupations*, November 1976, pp. 379-410
- 10 Thomas Green, *Work, Leisure, and the American Schools*, Random House, New York, 1968; also, Sebastian de Grazia, *Of Time, Work and Leisure*, The Twentieth Century Fund, 1962
- 11 James O'Toole, "Education, Work, and the Quality of Life," *Lifelong Learners — A New Clientele for Higher Education*, Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco, 1974, pp. 12-21
- 12 Herbert Levine, "Labor-Management Policies on Educational Opportunity," *Recurrent Education*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1974, pp. 197-212. For example, no more than \$3 million is reported used for tuition refunds out of a possible \$200 million a year in the automobile-related industries, much of it secured by contracts and agreements.
- 13 Thomas Gilbert, "Training: The \$100-Billion Opportunity," *Training and Development Journal*, November 1976, pp. 3-8
- 14 Allen Tough, *The Adult's Learning Projects*, The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, Toronto, Canada, 1971
- 15 Paul A. Miller, "A National Policy for Adult Education," *Adult Leadership*, January 1966, pp. 218ff
- 16 Gosta Rehn, "Towards Flexibility for Working Life," *Recurrent Education, et. al.*, pp. 177-186; also Willard Wirtz, *The Boundless Resource*, The New Republic Book Company, Inc., Washington, D.C. 1975
- 17 Willard Wirtz, *op cit*, especially Part I and Part III.
- 18 Alasdair Clayre, *Work and Play*, Harper and Row, New York, 1974

**Introducing the Honorable
Albert H. Quie**

Dr. Hunter:

Thank you Paul, and now I have the very great honor and pleasure to introduce the fourth of our major speakers this morning, the Honorable Albert H. Quie, United States Representative from the First District of Minnesota.

Representative Quie was born and raised in Minnesota, receiving his education in the public schools and St. Olaf College, where he earned his baccalaureate degree in political science in 1950. It was during his college studies that he became interested in politics, serving as President of the campus Young Republicans Club. While still in school, he took over the family dairy farm, but following graduation, he continued his political interests and activities. He was elected to the Minnesota Senate in 1954, where he served until his election to Congress in 1958.

Representative Quie is a farmer-legislator, a leader in the shaping of our national farm policies, and a recognized authority on agricultural issues,

but he is also a leading spokesman on education and currently the ranking Republican on the House Education and Labor Committee. He has received the highest national award from the American Council on Learning Disabilities for his leadership in the passing of legislation providing educational assistance to all handicapped children, and the Distinguished Citizen of Agriculture award for his services to agriculture and the dairy farmer.

Mr. Quie also holds seven honorary doctorate degrees and has been honored by numerous state and national rehabilitation, education, and vocational education agencies and associations. His interest, his concern, his leadership, and his deep insight and knowledge of public educational and vocational needs unquestionably qualify him to speak to us on behalf of government to the issues of our discussion.

I am most pleased and honored to present the Honorable Albert H. Quie.

Government and Continuing Education

Honorable Albert H. Quie
Committee on Education and Labor
U.S. House of Representatives



I am really pleased that this session has been convened by the Advisory Council with the single purpose in mind, as it has been indicated to all of us, "to forge a better alliance among management, labor leaders, professional educators, and Federal policy-makers to develop a more responsive public policy that will improve adult learning possibilities in the United States."

I have noted some people mention before that we have not developed a national policy on adult education. In fact, I do not know if it would be good to develop a single *national* policy. But we have not really developed a *Federal* policy either. Nor do we have the competence presently to do such, when we look at the fact that educational programs in the Federal government are authorized by over 400 laws and administered in over 25 different agencies. Manpower programs are authorized in 75 to 100 different statutes.

Because of that, I believe we ought to do some reorganization of the Federal government. I have advocated now for three Congresses that we establish a Department of Education and Manpower. And those of you who have been urging for some time a cabinet-level Department of Education, let me make it clear that I do not favor a cabinet-level Department of Education, but a Department of Education and Manpower. I believe that education and manpower programs are so interrelated that we will not develop wise Federal policies unless there is a cross-fertilization of these areas.

Now we have heard a great deal this morning of the interest in tying education to jobs and careers. Whether one argues that we are placing too great an emphasis on it or not, I think we do recognize

that education leading to jobs or careers is of utmost importance in our formal education system. Formal education is certainly addressed to that more so now than it was some years ago. The education effort that is sponsored by private industry, of course, is more totally addressed to jobs.

Now the question of who supports or pays for that is one that is going to be difficult for us to decide. I imagine that we will evolve that as we go along, because there are other demands on the Federal dollar than that which we are interested in this morning. And those demands are heard in various committees of Congress. We have a method now of balancing a little bit better in the Congress the competing demands for funds under the Budget Control and Impoundment Act. This new procedure enables the Congress to try and do some planning similar to what the Executive Branch does through the Office of Management and Budget.

We have seen a constant increase in the amount of money for education, and I believe this year, at least for the direct job-related programs, we might have a further increase than before because of high unemployment. But I do not look for the dramatic and drastic increase that we have had in the last few years — that may be about the rate at which we are going to move. That means increases a little bit better than the increase in the cost of living, but not an awful lot better than that. Again, I say that it will be that way because of the many other demands on the Federal government.

But I believe that there are some rules of thumb for Federal funding. One is that those who benefit the most ought to be paying a portion of the cost

of education. I believe that an individual who is going to receive some education or training will benefit from the program more if he or she does make some monetary contribution to it. To the extent that job training leads to the improvement of the business or the industry, I believe then that the business or industry ought to be making a sizable contribution to the cost of the program. And I believe that Federal government support will be mostly in the compulsory education area or else in remedial types of programs — either remedial for the individual or remedial for institutions, to encourage them to embark on certain activities in which they have not in the past.

I liked what Mr. Turner talked about concerning the IRS, about allowing a person to receive a deduction for whatever education he should embark on, not just job-related. And it has been an offense to me all the time that we tax people for doing things that we then fund with public dollars. We certainly do that with most formal education programs.

Now the Federal government could perhaps do more for helping research in education than in any other area. I have felt for a long time — since we have mentioned cooperative extension — considering what has happened in American agriculture and all the farm programs that we have had, that the most lasting and important benefit to American agriculture has been Federally funded research. The new technology that this has brought about has resulted in the dramatic increase in production in this country. And one of the reasons that we have such a strong defense system, again, is the amount of research that goes into our whole defense effort. We see the advance of medicine because we have made some outstanding efforts in medical research. I believe we have neglected educational research through the years. It is amazing to me that institutions of higher education — research institutions that have been involved so much in research in agriculture and defense and in medicine — have really not been pushing the way for greater research in education itself. Some of you have indicated our need to know how adults learn. Maybe we ought to ask how anybody learns. We still do not know that to the extent that we ought to. I recall a committee hearing with Dr. Bud Hutchinson, the Director of the National Institute of Education, who pointed out an interesting chart of students, some with the highest scholastic level and some with the greatest leadership ability. They seemed to be in inverse proportion to each other. The ones near

the bottom scholastically were showing more leadership than those on top, which I think ought to make all of you take another look at the criteria that you use to determine who is going to come in to provide leadership in your organizations.

I believe the Federal government could also help you by providing some needs assessment. I recognize that you perhaps have developed some substantial capability for your own industry, your own activity, but when we look at the broader picture, I believe the Federal government ought to be providing more assistance in that way. Not only to discover what is needed in the way of individuals to fill certain jobs, but also what kind of interest exists out there amongst the people for various types of training. In the Education Amendments of 1976, we authorized the establishment of Education Information Centers so that individuals interested in an education can find out what out there is available to them and what type of program they could find to provide the training and education that they need. These will be State-run and Federally-funded information centers.

Specifically related to lifelong learning and job training, there is another provision we added for the teaching profession — teacher centers. This idea was pushed by the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers. Instead of depending on institutions of higher learning for the retraining or upgrading of teachers, the centers would be developed within the school districts themselves, and the teachers themselves would be involved in their own improvement and betterment.

This leads me to a philosophy that I have been impressed with for a long time — one expounded by Dr. Leon Sullivan of the Opportunities Industrialization Centers. When I have asked him, "What's the secret to your success?" he says that the people who are being improved must contribute something to their own development. So when he starts an O.I.C., he goes to the groups themselves — in this case the Black community — to get them to put up some money first. And then he seeks business support, and then he seeks government support. Then the groups feel like it is their program and not something somebody else is foisting off on them.

When one looks at cooperative extension and the impact it has had — and it has been spoken of favorably this morning — I think a key is that farmers in the county where cooperative extension operates do not feel that that individual is an employee of the Federal government, or the State government, or even the land grant college.

In fact, they look at that individual as one of them because they contribute something to his or her salary in that local community. And I think that is important to their relationship.

I have noted this morning that we have spoken of the desire of institutions of higher education to be involved perhaps more in the training of individuals. My feeling is that many times we look at Federal legislation as a means to improve the lot of the professional educator or give a new lease on life to an institution of higher learning. If we do that, we do not address ourselves to problems with the proper perspective. I believe education and professional educators ought to be servants and not masters. The people we are interested in are the students — be they adult students or adolescent students — rather than the professional educators. The professional educator exists there because of the need of the student for his or her services.

I am struck by the availability of education programs outside of formal education. We hardly give attention to the whole system of television, for example. The information that is constantly given to us on the committee is that a person who finishes high school has spent more hours in front of the television set than in the classroom. I know from experience as well that adults tend to spend a great deal of time in front of television sets! And here, I believe, is an opportunity for education that we have not sufficiently tapped. I would mention the amount of violence on television that brings about a reaction within individuals, according to research, that is more anti-social and less caring for neighbors or community. The concern I have in our efforts, even in career education or lifelong learning, is that by addressing ourselves to such a great extent to jobs and upgrading the skills on the job, we do not fully appreciate what happens in the family or the community. Paraphrasing a King James version of the Scriptures, we are asked, "What does it avail a man if he gains the whole world and loses his soul?" We have made tremendous gains in technology and job opportunities in this nation, but it has come to my attention again, from Dr. Yuri Bronfenbrenner's article that appeared in the October issue of *Search Magazine* and was reprinted in *The Washington Post* a week ago yesterday, that we are doing little to address the calamity of the family.

I first met Dr. Bronfenbrenner 15 years ago. He laid out what he expected was going to happen in the family because of the way our industrial and urban society was moving. He pointed out then

that the father was not spending enough time in the home. Since then, we have continued to increase the percentage of women who do not spend their time in the home either. In his latest article, he reported that 39 percent of the women with children six years of age and under are working and therefore not in the home at that time when it would be expected. We read there and in other articles of the violence that this creates in human life. We are shocked by the figures of 2 million child abuse cases and many hundreds of little children killed by the persons caring for them, and by all of the other statistics on the violence that exists within us as a community, as a nation.

I think it behooves us, then, if we are going to look at national policy, to look at the policy not only in terms of what it does to provide skills for a job, but also what happens to those participating as they live with their family and in their community. Because if the family is being torn asunder more and more, do we have anything to replace it or can we replace it? There is no book on that.

In the 1920's the Soviet Union attempted a type of school, taking the children from the family at an early age, but it did not work, so officials visited Germany and based their education system from the '30s to the end of the 1950's on Germany's. Then in the late '50s they tried a more extensive residential school again, to develop a new human being for the socialist society. They began at pre-school age as early as two and a half months of age. And again, they had to go back to the family. I notice even in the kibbutzim in Israel the emphasis is now on parents coming and spending more time with children. I believe we need so much more research and policy discussion to determine how industry and government policy impacts on the family.

Vice President-elect Walter Mondale has done some work with his staff on developing the concept of family impact statements, just as we now have environmental impact statements or economic impact statements. Because, at least to date, human beings have not existed without the family being the most dominant unit in a tribe, or a village, or a nation state. Evidently the increase in individualism, where a person is more concerned about personal fulfillment in a selfish sense than about the responsibility for others that develops through the family, has been detrimental to the family. With more and more incidence of violence between human beings and disintegration of the family, communities suffer and the whole fabric of our society is hurt. With our transportation and technology, most communities grow larger. But

unless a person is willing to care for another person, on an individual basis, rather than through an institution — really care for them — I think we are going to be destroying ourselves.

I believe also, as we increase our lifelong learning, that we need to address ourselves to those strong moral questions that certain people are raising and which are causing industry to chaff. Ralph Nader is probably a name that gets people in industry more upset about than anyone else. Even so, there are some moral questions involved concerning the extent to which our resources are being used up and not replaced, and how human beings live and interact with one another.

As we embark, then, on this whole concept of continuing education and lifelong learning, I believe we must first address ourselves to the total picture of the human being and how that relates to the world in which we live. Secondly, we need to ask how we can develop into a strong community without the family being the main unit within which we operate. Because, in that interrelatedness that exists in a family, something happens that is hard to replace with formal education.

Let me use one example which I think will come clearly to you. About 45 years ago, a Dr. Skiels did research in hospitals and institutions for the mentally retarded. He took some children and put them into a group in which he assigned an older woman to be like a surrogate mother to each mentally retarded child in that institution. And then he had a control group where he treated the children just as one normally sees in institutions for the mentally retarded. He worked on that project for a number of years and eventually ran out of money.

About 15 years ago, it was decided to go back and see what had happened. Dr. Skiels was commissioned to look at those young people who were now adults because it was 30 years later. The results were interesting. Those in the control group, who were handled as you normally would expect in an institution for the mentally retarded, were either dead or still in the institution. The other group, in which patients were assigned a surrogate mother (inferior to a normal parent-child relationship, you might say, because they were mentally retarded) had all left the institution. Two of them had graduate degrees, and they had moved on as important members of society. The only difference you could point to there was a love of one individual for another, something that is

difficult to program or write up in an analysis of how human beings interrelate with each other. I think that is of tremendous importance.

The last point I would like to make is that I hope we will look at demographic charts. I have found that education tends to look backwards, science tends to look forward. Here we are talking about lifelong learning in education, and we are talking about something that is going to happen in the future. I recall five years before the teacher surplus situation surfaced, I talked to a group of educators and told them that we were going to have a surplus of teachers. I practically got run out of the room. Did I not know there was a teacher shortage? And how could I ever think that there was going to be a teacher surplus? Well, one only had to look at the number of young people going into our teacher training institutions in relationship to the number of children who were already born out there. I think we ought to bear in mind that 1959 was the peak year of births in this country: 4.3 million births. Those young people are now 18 years of age. It is no wonder that we have a tremendous problem with young people being unemployed. About half of the unemployed are young people below 24 years of age. For the last three years we have been running about 3.1 million live births — that is one-fourth less. And that wave in the population is going to carry all the way through the age group until finally they are retired. Those of us who are my age do not have to worry about retirement, I believe, because we will have all of those young people working and paying for our retirement system. And that is going to be great for us. At some point, however we ought to think ahead to what is going to happen to our retirement system when there are not as many of them contributing to it. We see the smaller numbers now in the school systems, where school classrooms are being closed. This reduced size of classes will impact on schools, colleges, the job market, and the economy generally for years to come.

People must begin thinking about less growth in this country. And that will mean a whole new adjustment in our economic system and our social system from what existed before. In that light we need to look at education, at jobs, at leisure time, and at retirement. I think it behooves us to try as best we can to think clearly on the matter and come up with some plans and policies which will address the future based on facts and the knowledge that we know now.

**Introducing the Honorable
Jacob K. Javits**

Dr. Hunter:

I now have the honor and the very great pleasure of introducing the closing major speaker of our Conference, the Honorable Jacob K. Javits, Senior United States Senator from New York, who will bring us his insights on and analysis of manpower issues.

Senator Javits, as you all know, is one of the most distinguished, most recognized, and most experienced public servants in our nation. He was born in New York City, educated in its public schools, attended Columbia University, and earned his law degree from New York University Law School. His political career began in 1932, and in his initial bid for elective office in 1946, he became the first Republican elected to the New York House of Representatives since 1923. After serving eight years in that seat, he became the Attorney General for the State in 1954. He won his election to the U.S. Senate in 1956, where he still serves — now in his fourth term, 28 con-

secutive years of public office.

The record of Senator Javits' achievements, committee assignments, offices, services, and honors is an extremely distinguished and extensive one. But most relevant and germane to our meeting and concerns today are his status as senior Republican on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the Joint Economic Committee, and the Select Committee on Small Business. Extremely active in international affairs, the author of a great many legislative acts, reforms, and programs, constant fighter for civil rights and for the disadvantaged, recipient of many, many honors and awards, the holder of 27 honorary degrees from our nation's colleges and universities, author of three books and contributor to numerous publications, certainly no one is more qualified to bring us a final statement than the senior United States Senator from New York, Senator Javits.

Education, Manpower, and Government

Honorable Jacob K. Javits
Committee on Labor and Public Welfare
U.S. Senate



Thank you, Chairman Hunter.

I would like to commend both your Chairman, Armand Hunter, and your Executive Director, James Turman, for the Conference topic and for the selection of the activist people here who are doing so much with manpower in the field. Their presence makes this Conference so very, very vital, because so often conferences are get-togethers of people who want to *talk* about things instead of people who want to *do* things. You are doing a fine job.

I looked over the booklet, "Scope of Work," last night, and picked something out of it which interested me greatly. It said this Conference "would give consideration in the area of manpower training and education with a view toward evaluating these efforts, minimizing duplication of expense, integrating private and public funds and programs, and developing delivery and incentive systems to increase participation in these programs."

I might tell you that that is the central theme of government today. We realize that in order to do what government needs to do, a totally new relationship must be developed between the public and private sectors. That has a great many connotations relating to the privilege of Senators and Congressmen to denounce any large business concern or industrialist, because that is an awfully easy and popular thing for them to do, and there is nobody to fight back. They describe a cozy relationship between the regulatory agencies and the people the agencies are supposed to regulate.

I have given you the span representing discipline by us in Congress, and discipline by you

— the people in the business world.

I believe that the hallmark of the modern day is the performance standard. In order to achieve what we need to for the people of this country, indeed for the people of this world, it is going to take a very smooth working partnership between government and business. And I do not believe big business or any kind of business is going to be capable of being conducted without that partnership. I am sure that government, too, will fall on its face without it, in the sense of meeting the urgent demands of the people. However, it is going to be very tricky, because no one is really accustomed to that kind of partnership. We may think we are, but we are not. Business is scared to death of partnership with government. The tax collector and the anti-trust lawyer and the Department of Justice are always around, as well as sundry other criminal laws and the Internal Revenue Service. And government is scared to death of business on the ground that it is not really capable of keeping up with what business is doing and why, and is always justifying a policy which seems pro business to the people. You may not think that our government officials are afraid of this, but they are.

So there is a lot of learning to be done in this field. I emphasize that because it is the key to what will be happening in Washington in the 95th Congress. Almost everything you might look at — manpower, health, education, foreign aid, you name it — will demonstrate evidence of the need to work out a cooperative relationship of a very intimate kind between business and government, with money, authority, and performance moving easily in both directions.

The thing that interests me very deeply about your work — because it is an issue closely related to education — involves one of the structural problems in the United States — the need to employ the unacceptable number of unemployed we have. It is simply ridiculous for our country to have 7.5 million non-productive people who are ready and prepared for a job. Some estimates take us up to 10 and 11 million, if we include people who have dropped out of the labor market or do not even seek to work. I think that figure of 7.5 million is untenable, and it is the very minimum.

I say it is ridiculous because in this country so many of our people have not completed high school. We even have illiterates in the United States. So many people have not even gone to a technical institute or a community college for two years of specialized training. Yet we know that the work force of the United States in terms of professionals or quasi-professionals needs to be doubled. We estimate that about a quarter of the American work-force is going to have to be professionally trained or retrained in the next decade. So the concept of lifetime education is a very, very critical one, and that is what attracted me to accept your invitation to appear today.

I believe that the worker's life must be composed of three elements: work, training, and education. Each is a lifetime pursuit, and that is especially true as we try to solve geriatric problems and given our longer lifespans.

At the close of the last session of Congress, we passed the Education Amendments of 1976, which expanded Title I of the Higher Education Act to include a new program of lifelong learning. I joined in that with the man who is now going to be Vice President, Fritz Mondale. I would like to read to you from the act, one of its findings. It says, "Learning takes place through formal and informal instruction, through educational programs conducted by public and private educational and other institutions and organizations, through independent study and through the efforts of business, industry, and labor."

That is part of the definition of lifelong learning. The Health, Education, and Welfare assistant secretary of education is directed under these amendments to carry out studies and programs relating to lifelong learning. The National Advisory Council will remain a significant source of counsel in this emerging area. One of the aspects of the act — particularly relevant to the jobs and economic stimulation theme that we hear so much about today — is that Health, Education, and Welfare will undertake studies, to include the

opportunities provided by employers, trade unions, libraries, and educational institutions, on ways to meet career and occupational needs for education. The Congress will benefit greatly from those studies. We understand that they will involve participants from many of the organizations which are present here today. You have a lot of friends in Congress who favor this idea, including the Vice President and people like myself who participated in the enactment of this law.

Another relevant element in the new law which affects education and work is the amendments, which we adopted at the same time, to the Vocational Education Act. Its primary thrust is to reorient State and local planning of vocational education to include the organizational components previously excluded. For example, annual and long-range plans for vocational education, submitted by the States to the Office of Education, will now be prepared in consultation with a full range of the parties who are represented here today, including business elements as well as the other organizations.

In the past, the Federal manpower program known as the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act, and vocational education programs, have been planned independently, with a constant risk of duplication and simply starting new programs from square one without examining existing programs and prior experience. We now believe that many persons, young and old, remain unserved in their educational training needs as those needs relate to their employment. Under the new Vocational Education Law, business and labor, as well as prime sponsors in CETA programs, will be working together in developing plans for vocational education work. Thus, the education amendments which we passed last fall give us very critical and very precise work/education linkages.

In addition to lifelong learning and vocational education, which I have described, the law which we passed gives new planning authority for career education, yet another element beyond the others I have just mentioned.

The last point that I wish to discuss is a bill which is being introduced today, and which is very, very strongly related to the subject of this Conference. It is a bill which Hubert Humphrey and I are introducing which deals with the very grave problem that the youth of our country bear an unbelievably disproportionate burden of the joblessness in America. This is not only a critical personal problem, but a very critical social problem, because this is a country of young

people. One-half of the total number of the unemployed people in the United States today are — I regret to say — under the age of 24. As you know, the rate of the unemployment for minority group teenagers is simply astronomical. You simply cannot believe that there are communities in which as many as 60 percent of the youth who are in the job market and interested in a job are unemployed. People look around for the causes of crime and the causes of community breakdown. I do not think you have to look any further than that statistic in order to see that the young person who has no sanctions in terms of an employer or peer relationships which are developed through work, and who lives in a miserable climate in terms of housing, food, and social contacts, is an absolute prime candidate for some form of criminal activity. We believe that the problem is very considerably understated, even by the statistic that one-half of the unemployed are under 24 years of age. Based on what I said when I began, it does not include those who are not even in the job market, not looking for jobs, and not counted as unemployed, and those who have dropped out of the job market because they have simply given up.

Indeed, a year ago the Manpower Commission reported that there were 600,000 youths outside the labor force who reported that they wanted a job but were not looking for one. When you add to them discouraged employees or potential employees, part-timers who are underemployed, you get an unbelievable total. We estimate that the total approaches 5.5 million young people, and that nationally the youth unemployment rate is about 35 percent. The official figures show 3.6 million unemployed youth. And obviously, unemployment hits very, very heavily in minority group and poverty group areas.

In addition to the factors which I have described, you also have cyclical factors which very adversely affect youth. Young workers seem to be let go in droves the minute that there is any kind of economic crunch. We also find that there are regional disparities with respect to youth unemployment, in that given labor markets are much more susceptible to cyclical unemployment than other markets. Perhaps the reason is discrimination, racial or ethnic, but it is also because of the high calibre of employees required in given areas of the country.

Of course, the problem which I have described is made more complicated by the urban crisis — the urban decay and the financial inability of urban areas to achieve that degree of self-improvement which makes available a great deal

more employment. In addition, we find that those conditions are forcing a migration of many major employers from the cities, and create a reluctance on their part to locate new facilities or to expand existing plants in older cities, a situation which further depresses labor markets. And youth, unfortified by necessary education and training, are not in a position to follow jobs to new locations. All of these conditions are very, very deleterious to the employment of youth and have brought about a terrible situation.

Now, the bill which Senator Humphrey and I are introducing today — and that is why I have to be back — has a number of programs which are very germane to what you have been discussing. The bill is such immediate news that I would like to lay it before you.

First, our bill would mandate the establishment of education work committees composed of prime sponsors of public service employment programs as well as CETA programs. These councils would review and make recommendations concerning youth employment plans. It is a very bold effort to marry the concepts of work and continuing education in a context where we have a measure of control: to wit, government-supported CETA programs.

Second, we propose to establish a program of youth opportunities in private enterprise, to prepare and place up to half a million youths in productive employment in the private sector. We would do that by allowing prime sponsors — that is, prime sponsors of CETA programs — to contract with non-profit private agencies, such as community service agencies, as well as with private-for-profit employers — to train unemployed youths for private sector jobs.

Now, you are all acquainted with the so-called "jobs" program which is run by private business, but which has no government subsidy which would permit reimbursement for on-the-job training expenses incurred by profit-making enterprises. Special consideration would be given to employers who agree to subcontract with community-based organizations for referral of youths ready for on-the-job training.

If unemployed youth are to obtain non-subsidized, full-time employment as adults, they should have some work experience in the private sector and should be provided with needed skills. We would provide funds to upgrade the employability of youths, to cover both counselling and training. This is apart from the special provisions which I have just described for youth opportunities in private enterprise. We would

provide counselling and other forms of comparable attention as well as skills training. We would authorize reimbursement of extraordinary non-wage expenses, including training expenses, for those who hire disadvantaged youth.

Third, we propose to establish a program of work experience for in-school youth. That is a novel Federal concept, but it has been done in the States. It is designed to provide youths with job experience prior to completion of secondary school. Under our bill, again the CETA prime sponsors would enter into agreements with local education agencies, which in turn would contract with public and private employers to provide part-time work specifically related to the education program of the secondary school student. Upon certification by a school-based counselor that the work is an appropriate component of the student's total program, reimbursement would be provided for training and recruitment expenses incurred by an employer. For example, the most obvious examples of that idea would involve students in high school woodworking shops, or metallurgical shops, or printing shops, or youngsters who are studying secretarial work in high school. All of these students could enroll in a work/education program, which would be for academic credit and be supported by this form of subsidization.

Now I believe that our bill, which as I say, we are putting in at three o'clock this afternoon, initiates the kind of collaborative processes among educators and employers that are required to build bridges between the world of education and the world of work. It would significantly expand our nation's occupational information and career counselling efforts. The bill would permit prime sponsors under public service employment programs to arrange with public and private non-profit agencies, with the U.S. Employment Service or with local education agencies, to place trained counsellors with experience in work/education in schools and junior colleges. It would establish a national occupational information and career guidance service to improve coordination of education and work data and improve the collection and availability of data at national, State, and local levels.

This is the content of the Youth Employment Bill. It represents, in my opinion, an enormous reform and would be extremely helpful for youth. Our continued toleration of persistent and endemic youth unemployment could not be more improvident. Indeed, we are courting disaster if we

continue, as we have, simply to treat youth joblessness as routine. As a nation, we are telling the young people that they have no place in American society. How can they possibly attain the American dream if the government itself has no deep concern about their capability, as well as their opportunities, to enter into the employment stream?

I would like to give you just one quote from Professor Eli Ginzberg of Columbia University, Chairman of the National Commission on Manpower Policy. Two sentences: "If we want trouble, the way to get it is to ignore the seriousness of this problem (youth unemployment)." "We'll have living hell."

Notwithstanding all of the things that are said and written about the cynicism and disillusionment of youth, our young people are still enthusiastic, and they are still eager. But they may not stay this way if we fail to show a suitable national concern for their dilemma. Their dilemma is that they are simply not trained and educated for the work tasks, nor are they trained and educated for a life in which work is the basic component.

But education has other attributes in addition to enhancing ability to work through adequate skill training. It provides cultural preparation for a life which constantly offers more and more possibilities for recreation and cultural enjoyment as technology more and more limits the amount of actual time which is required to earn a living.

So I came this afternoon, really at a very great personal sacrifice, to honor a commitment. But much more importantly I came to share with you some ideas in order to emphasize the critical importance of what you are doing and because there is so much of American business represented here. If I tell you nothing more and you take home nothing else, just get yourselves all geared up and ready to work with government. And, if you do not like the way government works, then become active politically and beat it over the head so it works well. Because I can promise you one thing — if you want freedom, there is no other way. Either government will do it for us or we will do it with government. To save the United States, our system and our freedom, that is naturally the way we want it. And that is the way it is going to have to be. We all had better get accustomed to the idea, and take a lot more time than we have in training for it — in just such sessions as this Conference.

Thank you.

Summary of the First Workshop Session and Charge to the Concluding Session

Dr. Herbert A. Levine
Director, Labor Education Center,
Rutgers University

(Dr. Hunter:

I would now like to introduce one of the hard-working members of the Planning Committee for this Conference and the primary drafter of the scope of work statement, Dr. Herbert A. Levine, Director of the Labor Education Center at Rutgers University. I am sure that Herb is well-known to many of you and really needs no introduction, but he is going to have one anyway.

In terms of work on this Conference, Herb is the ramrod or straw boss of your workshop sessions, and he has a message for you. It is with pleasure and deep appreciation that I now present our distinguished colleague, scholar, and friend, Herb Levine.)

The Council is working under two pressures. First is time. The Council, like it or not, has to justify its existence by putting in a formal report to the President and Congress by March 30, even though by that time it will not have the solution to most of the philosophical questions we have raised. The Council, nevertheless, must say something intelligible to the House and to the Senate, and to the President.

That is the first. The second is that at 11:30 a.m., I have been told, the Xerox Training Center is going out on strike. So that unless you can come to a settlement between now and 11:30, the place is going to be shut down. And if they ever turn off the air conditioning, God help us.

So we are under those kinds of pressures. And we are at the stage, the hour before the close of negotiations, where we have got a laundry list of recommendations so long that it seems im-

possible for us to zero in on a settlement. I hope that the labor management people who have been sitting back wondering what you educators have been doing to us here the last few days will now be able to show effectively that their experience, their life experience, which we sometimes like to get credit for, has meaning and use. They will show you that they know how to resolve a laundry list of problems — at least tentatively — for now — not forever, not for all time — but to come now to some agreement on at least some areas in which we have a consensus.

What we would like is for each workshop to try to limit itself to eight recommendations. If one of them comes up with nine, we will not throw them out. We will accept them. But try to come up with approximately eight areas of agreement or specific recommendations. All individual recommendations, even if they only come from one person, will be transmitted to the Council for its consideration. But we would like you to have some sort of consensus on those special eight. And, as Dan Marvin pointed out, if there are two strong opinions, we would like to hear both opinions on that particular issue.

Now, somebody said around the table last night that it is not a question of whether or not we want lifelong learning. We have got it and we have to like it whether we actually do so or not. We have got it. The question is, what do we do with it? So, I will try to rephrase some of the problems with which we would like you to deal in your workshop sessions.

The first question is, do we have enough

knowledge about the lifelong learning needs of American society? Management, labor, working people, professionals, technicians, and so on? What kinds of education should be available? How do we resolve what appear sometimes to be conflicts of interest? For example, if an employer hires people to do some work, he wants productivity, he wants a product he can sell. But the workers may be more concerned with the living conditions under which they will be working. And the educator has institutional prerogatives that concern him in educational enterprises.

There is also the question of who should pay. Should the individual pay? Should the company pay? Should the government pay? What form of expenditure of resources shall we have? What incentive should there be for the various parties to participate in the educational enterprise? What do you have to give the worker to encourage participation? Why should the employer be interested? Why should the government be interested?

Well, the very significant point is, how do we talk about all this? I feel from conversations that have been going on well into the morning, at an unmentionable place, that some people are more ready than others to come to conclusions. I have a feeling, particularly among the labor and management groups, that they are a little less ready to say, yes, let us do this, or yes, let us do that. There is a need for some longer period of consultation and involvement. The educators have been plowing along for the last generation or so, but the others have been watching, maybe critical of educational institutions, maybe sometimes ignoring them or attempting to, and have been setting up educational establishments of their own as a consequence. Maybe we need to continue those efforts, or maybe we need to integrate them in some fashion.

I feel that it might be helpful if you could suggest to the Council how we might develop a continuing way to talk about the problems with which we are all faced. Is just another series of conferences in order, or is there some other kind of dialogue that we could have? How can we understand each other and what we are trying to do?

Another area concerns how we delineate the various responsibilities — that is, what must management do, what should labor do, what role should the government play?

I do not think there are clear-cut answers about those particular problems. One of the ways to delineate responsibilities that people have suggested several times might be to set up

demonstration projects — though the question of how you set them up is an open question. If you have several divisions in your establishment, whether you are part of education or business or labor, you might try certain kinds of efforts in one area, and then judging by their success or failure, determine which way you want to go in others. As I indicated to a few at breakfast, I saw Errol Flynn try that the other day on a late show. He had a beautiful white horse, and he said, "Michigan 1st, forward." When he turned around, the whole Michigan 1st had been decimated, but his white horse was still going strong. So he went back and said, "Michigan 2nd, forward." And it was very romantic, but the Michigan 2nd was also decimated. And back again he came on his white horse, which was not tired or anything, and he said, "Michigan 3rd, forward." And boy, it went right through the Southern line like a duck through water, and was successful. The point is, if you have enough divisions and a big white horse, you are going to make it. That is trial by error.

Anyway, of course, we have learned about how to produce by watching the Edsel being produced. So there are many ways that you can learn things. And one of them, people suggest, is to try things. See how they work. If they do not work, well, we are not committing ourselves to a lifelong effort in that particular field. We need a whole series of demonstration projects.

Another issue is that we really do not know what resources we have. And one question that came up — how do we budget? How does the Federal government sit down and decide how much money to put into lifelong learning? Nobody really came up with a precise answer, but it was a real problem. How much resources should management be applying to education and training, *in toto*?

Each company has to decide that for itself, and if you look in the American Society of Training and Development manual that my friend Bob Craig sent me recently, you will see that the Chrysler Company had an article called "How to Budget." I found it very informative. Of course, I deal in much smaller terms and amounts, but if you really want to plan a budget, you have got quite a problem, especially if you are asking the Federal government to plan a budget on a lifelong learning issue which is for all citizens — tall ones, short ones, long ones, organized workers, unorganized workers, management people, professionals, teachers. We are talking about lifelong learning for all citizens. So the budget problem needs to be thought through, including what is the proper

assessment for each segment of the community, and how it should occur — through taxes or through payments or through entitlements. Hopefully, you might have some notions about that.

Now there are a few items that have come up in several of the workshops, but we are not sure whether all the workshops would agree with them one way or another, so I will put them to you, and you might like to discuss them somewhere along the way:

There was a proposal that perhaps the Council should recommend a White House Conference. At least two workshops included that in their recommendations. You might give that some thought.

There was a question of whether or not the group would like to recommend that, if there is to be a separate Department of Education, it should include education *and* manpower. Two workshops took a position on that, and apparently at this moment they do not think that manpower and education should be linked together. But that is for you to decide.

A third area that has been raised several times is the role of counselling and the training of counselors and where counselors should be located. Should they be in schools, should they function as cooperative extension agents, should they be in the plants, at job sites, should they be roving counsellors? There are several suggestions on that issue. You might also give it some thought.

The educators, of course, seem to be almost unanimous for full-funding of lifelong education. That is a good phrase in the educational field, and we all like it. However, most of the management and labor people and others who might not be educators, and perhaps even some educators, might admit that they have not read the Lifelong Learning Bill. They do not know what the Lifelong Learning Bill actually says. Not the one that we might pass someday, or not what lifelong learning might become, but lifelong learning as defined now by the law. It is only about two pages, but my bet is that out of this group, 90 percent of the people here have never read those two pages. And if we have not read it, and we have been talking about it for two and a half days, we can imagine what kind of confusion must exist in the rest of the world. Perhaps the Council would be kind enough to send a copy of the Lifelong Learning Bill to all participants in this Conference. Maybe we should have done it in advance.

The point is, we say full-funding — it is an easy phrase — but what do we mean? Full-funding of what, and for what? Should there be free tuition? Should somebody who gets free tuition also get

full pay? If yes, fine; if not, why not? Should funds be available to management from the government if it gives a worker a leave of absence from a job? Is there any funding available for whatever adjustments may have to be made at the workplace in order to arrange for the training of a worker to replace another worker? What role, if any, do the vocational schools play?

In most of our workshops, vocational schools got very short shrift. Did we invite any representatives? Are there any vocational educators in this group? Put a hand up if you are a vocational educator. I guess they are all tired out from their trip to Houston and their trip up to Minnesota, and so they are not here. We ought to give a little thought as persons who are not primarily involved with vocational schools to why we are spending all that money on vocational schools if they are not integrally related to the job — and work-related training that we are saying is necessary.

Another area of concern raised in two workshops was the question of illiteracy. One person at breakfast said, "The greatest ripoff that has ever hit any society, especially the American society, is the fact that a human being can come to adulthood in our country and still be illiterate." That is something that is very hard to digest, that a country so dedicated to the educational concept, with so much money available for education, and with so many agencies engaged in education, can still have illiteracy, and that it approaches, in some places, a disastrous situation.

The question is, how does that situation affect us? After all, we are talking about adults and not about youngsters.

That concern relates to discussions of the recommendations on the points that Congressman Quie mentioned. What role does the family play in all of this? And is it possible, when we think about educating adults who are illiterate, that we might educate them along with their family members, so that adults who are illiterate might learn along with their children and other members of their family who might not be children, how to read and how to prepare themselves for an educational enterprise? There might be some integration of adult education with what was formerly considered a separate educational system for the young.

Well, I would like to make a long speech about the Organization for Economic and Community Development and what is going on in Europe, but one of the things that we would appreciate your doing — we know you do not have too much time

— is to consider some of the definitions floating in the air, such as that of continuing education. What is it? Are there relevant distinctions to be made among continuing education, extension education, career education, occupational education, lifelong learning? Are we talking more or less about the same thing or different things?

It is not the definition that is so important, but whether your definition requires a specific kind of action. Does lifelong learning require one kind of action, occupational education a different kind? So, think of definitions only in terms of action, at least for the time being.

We would like to suggest two mundane matters. When you get back to your workshops, we ask that you take a few moments to recapitulate yesterday's discussions. Let everybody who might have come up with a bright idea last night express it once again, or rephrase a proposition that was made the day before. And then, if you could appoint a timekeeper for your group, let that

person work you through the next session on a timed basis. If you have eight recommendations to decide on, maybe you would like to divide your time accordingly. And we are asking the chairman of your group to be kind and considerate to all of you, but not to abuse you by letting you keep talking so that you do not come out of your workshop with something that satisfies the group in terms of recommendations.

In closing, let me repeat that although we want eight specific recommendations, anything that you put up on the table will be included in the report to the Council.

I am very pleased about the character of this Conference and I have the feeling that, after you have said what it is that you want to say, we have a group of distinguished and capable people, led by our two chairmen here, who will digest it and most likely discard everything that we say, but at least they will have benefited from listening.

So, I think we should proceed. I thank you.

Summary of Workshop Sessions and Recommendations

Ms. Sylvia G. McCollum

Education Administrator, Bureau of Prisons,
U.S. Department of Justice

(Dr. Hunter:

The job of pulling together the findings and reports of the workshop discussions and outlining them in the "gestalt" of a summary presentation is an extremely tough one, as you all know. And when you need a tough job done, you have to call upon a very able person. We are fortunate to have just such a highly able and qualified individual, our own Sylvia McCollum, Education Administrator, Bureau of Prisons, U.S. Department of Justice, and a member of our Advisory Council.)

Just a general disclaimer before beginning. There is no way that I can possibly capture all that was said at all of the workshops. I am hoping that we will have enough imagination to include under the general categories that I will be talking about some of our own pet words and phrases. If I do not capture the nuances, and you feel very strongly, we will have an opportunity after I summarize for you to stand up and say — "but this did not include such and such." But I would urge you, unless it is pressing, unless it really does not come under some of the major categories, that you do not do that. We will be providing the staff of the Council with the very detailed summaries of each workshop so that, if my summary does not include all that you feel it should, those additional papers will be provided to the staff.

Emerging from all of the workshops seemed to be a clear feeling that there needs to be an increased Federal leadership and responsibility in all areas of education, but particularly with respect to what we have called at this Conference "lifelong learning."

Several of the workshops felt that the leadership role could be achieved through the creation of a

cabinet-level Federal department. There was divided opinion regarding whether or not this Federal cabinet should include, in addition to education responsibilities, manpower responsibilities. I think there was consensus that the Federal government needs to take a stronger role in leadership and responsibility, and that the way to achieve that is through the establishment of a cabinet-level Department of Education.

Interestingly enough, one of the workshops felt that in addition to the Federal cabinet-level department, there should be a non-governmental national coordinating body that would continue to focus on lifelong learning and education in general. There seemed to be a desire for both the Federal presence and for a national group made up of non-Federal interests.

The question of a White House Conference appears to have come up in each of the groups, and again, opinion was divided. Some felt that a White House Conference was an obsolete art form of the '50s and '60s and that the '70s require a different approach. There was agreement, however, that if there were a White House Conference on Education, the important subject of lifelong learning should be placed on the agenda.

There was a great deal of discussion in all of the workshops on the question of funding: funding not only for agencies and programs, but funding for individual entitlement to education. One of the recommendations that emerged in several of the workshops was adequate funding for Title I of the Higher Education Act. This was accompanied by a recommendation that individuals be able to buy into educational opportunities through proper tax

allowances, and that funding be provided for part-time students so that they have the same kinds of advantages or opportunities as full-time students.

The question of money, of course, was a very significant discussion in all groups. It was strongly recommended that steps be taken to improve the funding of individual agencies and all groups involved in the whole educational process.

Another very important subject that cut across all groups was the question of extension services for education. The recommendations were very strong that extension services be established, that they provide information as well as counselling services at the local and other levels, and that funds be made available to implement and make active the already authorized information and counselling centers and clearinghouses for educational information.

There was agreement that we need to reemphasize the need for a national focus on research in education. The Federal government should have a very clear-cut responsibility for leadership and funding in the whole area of educational research.

There seemed to be consensus that we need to

have further linkages among education, government, industry, business, labor, and other groups that were not necessarily part of this Conference.

There was also interest in a continuation of the kind of dialogue that this Conference represents. Hopefully, this Conference is not a one-shot kind of dialogue, and that from it mechanisms will be found to continue the interchange that we have shared this day and a half, not only among ourselves, but with other groups that are not represented here today.

A very strong point was made by one group that any Federal program should have as one of its major priorities a focus on basic functional competencies, so that people can be helped to deal with the complexities of our modern society.

I see the above points as the major categories of recommendations. There were many subheadings, and many sub-subheadings and subjects. But I do think that all of those that were discussed fit in some way into the major categories I have just listed.

Thank you.

Recommendations of the Workshops

The following is a list of the major recommendations and issues expressed to the Council by participants in the Conference workshops. Approximately 50 recommendations or issues were generated for further consideration by the Council. They are organized here under broad categories which better reflect the participants' general areas of concern.

The Council appreciates the assistance it received through the Conference. In the months ahead, the Council will seriously review each recommendation and issue and will initiate follow-up action and study of those which are especially relevant to its Congressional mandate. The recommendations and issues which the Council endorses will appear in the form of further reports, studies, Congressional testimony, and official submissions to the President, the Congress, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Commissioner of Education.

A. Federal Research and Development Activities

There was general consensus that there ought to be a major Federal effort in research and development on continuing education and lifelong learning in the following areas:

- 1) A comparative study of the European experience with adult continuing education and lifelong learning activities.
- 2) An examination of the American credentialing system and of its brokers.
- 3) The appropriateness of the current system of providing continuing education, in terms of

new clientele and their needs.

- 4) Identification of the reasons for non-participation in continuing education and lifelong learning activities.
- 5) The development of strategies for the elimination of the barriers to participation.
- 6) An identification of issues related to tax disincentives to participation.
- 7) A demographic study of adult continuing education and lifelong learning needs.
- 8) An examination of how continuing education and lifelong learning activities are to be provided.

In addition to the above items, the participants specifically requested that the National Advisory Council undertake the following research priorities:

- 1) A study to determine the various forms of continuing education as they are understood, financed, and administered by the organizations represented at the Conference.
- 2) An examination of various successful demonstration continuing education activities conducted by the primary parties with continuing education responsibilities, including forms of subsidy, delivery systems, and programming, with special attention to cooperative efforts by two or more of these parties.
- 3) An examination of the current forms of incentives for participation in continuing education and, on the basis of this effort, a determination of the appropriate application of Federal tax dollars to continuing

education and lifelong learning activities.

- 4) An exploration of a sample cross-section of publicly funded adult continuing education programs in terms of quality, relevance, and effectiveness along the lines of industry's evaluation of its own programs, and thereby developing exemplary models of response to demonstrated learning needs.

B. The Federal Role in Providing Financial Aid to Continuing Education and Lifelong Learning

The question of "Who pays?" and "For what?" and "How?" was evident in all the workshops. There was general agreement that the Federal government had an important role to play in supporting continuing education and lifelong learning, but that this role was as yet undetermined and ought to be determined in conjunction with a better understanding of the current resources available from organized labor, business and industry, State and local governments, and other agencies. It was suggested that:

- 1) Federal incentives ought to be developed to encourage the non-Federal community to support continuing education and lifelong learning.
- 2) Tax relief should be provided for non-job-related educational activities.
- 3) The cost of all off-the-job lifelong learning should be deductible from income tax when not paid from public funds, but that this should not be a substitute for the need of the Federal government to subsidize lifelong learning for all individuals, including programs conducted by unions and industries.
- 4) Alternative methods should be considered for providing entitlements to lifelong learning; such as:
 - a) unlimited right by birth;
 - b) a set term limited to two or four years; and
 - c) drawing rights based on the number of years worked.
- 5) Federal funds be used to support demonstration efforts dealing with non-traditional cooperative arrangements among the primary parties in continuing education in support of continuing education and lifelong learning.
- 6) Federal funds should be available for institutional support, as well as for subsidies for part-time students. This support should

be directed to:

- a) persons not now equitably served by continuing education;
 - b) those most in need; and
 - c) those for whom such aid will have the greatest impact — those who are technologically and geographically displaced, the unemployed, and employees of small businesses.
- 7) Financial and other support services available to the full-time student should also be available to the part-time student.

C. Reorganization of the Federal Education Establishment

It was generally agreed that because of the escalation of interest and demand for continuing education and lifelong learning among broad segments of the American public, there should be some kind of administrative reorganization at the Federal level that would demonstrate a response to this interest. There was general agreement that:

- 1) There be created a cabinet-level agency on education, with responsibility for policy-making, administration, and monitoring of Federal education activities.
- 2) The manpower services and programs of the Federal government not be included in any cabinet-level Department of Education.
- 3) There be established a high-level national coordinating body, either independent of or part of a Federal agency, with policy, oversight, and administrative responsibility for Federal extension and continuing education and lifelong learning activities.
- 4) There should be ongoing consideration of legislation for consolidation of the various categorical programs for continuing education, and of ways to reduce the competition among various agencies for appropriated funds in these areas.
- 5) The functions of the various national advisory councils on education should be reviewed for the purposes of better coordination; representation on these councils should reflect the interests of labor, business and industry, government, and education.

D. Information and Dissemination of Federal Education Programs and Services

Although most workshop participants were

generally aware of Federal involvement in education, many expressed dissatisfaction with the lack of convenient and usable information services regarding Federal programs. The following recommendations were therefore expressed:

- 1) The Federal government should provide a coordinated effort at one location from which users could obtain information about federally supported education services, programs, and research findings.
- 2) Existing information clearinghouses in continuing education and related fields should improve their ability to disseminate information and to respond quickly and effectively to inquiries. Also, such clearinghouses should broaden their membership to include the interests of labor and business and industry.
- 3) The education information centers recently authorized by the Education Amendments of 1976 should be set up to respond to labor, business, and education's specific requests for information on Federally funded lifelong learning opportunities.
- 4) The Council should take action to publicize the availability and applicability of the Basic Education Opportunity Grant Program and other Federal financial aid programs to continuing education and lifelong learning.
- 5) There should be available to all adults, as a right, access to counselling services to assist them in preparation for work; information about, and referrals to, education and career opportunities and resources should also be available, as well as technical assistance to help people with career planning. These activities should use existing resources, where available, or resources should be expanded where necessary.

E. Federal Support for Educational Extension Services and Delivery Systems

Most of the workshops reported recommendations calling for an improvement and expansion of delivery systems that, in effect, would determine the success of a timely and efficient Federal response to demonstrated learning needs. The recommendations included:

- 1) A Federal continuing education policy, to be based on matching supply to both expressed and latent demands for education through local delivery systems. This can be achieved through collaborative planning by local business, labor, government, and

educational institutions.

- 2) The need for the Council to seek and support Congressional action to develop a labor extension service to provide training and education for workers, and that this labor extension service be modelled upon the Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture. This extension service would assist the unemployed as well as the employed worker.
- 3) Support for an expansion of the extension service concept to meet business and industry, labor, and urban needs.
- 4) As a matter of public policy, Federal government support for an urban extension program, to be provided primarily through institutional and program grants and not as payments to individuals.

F. Continuation of the Dialogue Among the Primary Supporters of Continuing Education and Lifelong Learning

Although some workshop participants expressed uneasiness over the lack of focus in the specific objectives of the Invitational Conference and the lack of clarity about many of the terms used, i.e., "continuing education" and "lifelong learning," most workshops reported recommendations endorsing the idea of national and local dialogue among the primary parties on the themes of the Conference:

- 1) Provisions should be sought to continue a dialogue on continuing education and lifelong learning among the parties involved, not only at the Federal and national levels, but at the local level as well.
- 2) These dialogues should be used to strengthen the links between education and work.
- 3) These dialogues should be continued by urging the convening of a White House conference on adult and continuing education.
- 4) These dialogues should continue through a new Presidentially-appointed commission.
- 5) These dialogues should continue through use of existing agencies, such as the Center for Productivity and the Quality of Working Life.
- 6) This dialogue should continue because of the lack of unanimity among the primary parties regarding the proper role of the Federal government in supporting lifelong learning and continuing education, and

should treat specific recommendations for Federal policies in these areas. The Conference can be viewed only as a first step in this direction.

G. Funding Proposals for Title I, Parts A and B

When discussing Title I of the Higher Education Act, most of the workshops appeared to concentrate on the new lifelong learning program authorized by Title I, Part B. It was proposed that:

- 1) The Council support full-funding for the new lifelong learning program authorized by Title I, and that a first priority in the implementation of this program be the clearing-house functions specified by the Congress.
- 2) There be adequate funding for programs and activities conducted under Title I (both Parts A and B) of the Higher Education Act.
- 3) That current Federal legislation for continuing education should be full-funded (specific programs were not identified).

H. Broad Federal Policies

In addition to the many policy-oriented recommendations contained in the above categories, two additional policy recommendations were mentioned:

- 1) There should be a Federal policy to insure that all citizens have access to and opportunities for continuing education, with first priority given to education for employment. Opportunities for leisure time and other personal learning needs should also be made available.
- 2) A continuing education policy needs to be formulated, vital for two major areas:

- a) for updating and upgrading occupational competencies; and
- b) for personal development to help individuals function competently in a family and as citizens in a rapidly changing society.

I. White House Conference

In addition to the above recommendation suggesting the vehicle of a White House conference to continue a national dialogue on continuing education and lifelong learning, the following recommendations were also made:

- 1) Should a White House conference on education be convened, the Council should seek to have continuing education and lifelong learning as a major focus of it.
- 2) Since a White House conference is an outdated concept of the '50s and '60s, a more suitable Federal response in the '70s would be a national study commission with specific research objectives identified, including that of a national needs assessment of adult learning opportunities.
- 3) If a White House conference were convened, it should represent the major parties participating at the Conference, and should consider the following:
 - a) a "Bill of Rights" for lifelong learning;
 - b) a continuing dialogue on definitions, concepts, and forms relating to "continuing," "basic," "vocational," "recurrent" education, etc.; and
 - c) the promotion of a primary citizenship within family, education, and work, all integrated into a total living experience as a way to deal with the fundamental crises of society.

Appendix A: Conference Agenda

Sunday, January 9

6:00 p.m. — Registration

10:00 p.m.

9:00 p.m. — Discussion Leaders and

10:00 p.m. Planning Committee
Members Meet

Monday, January 10
Morning Session

9:00 a.m. Conference Convenes

- **Welcoming Address**

ARMAND L. HUNTER

Chairman, NACECE

*Director, The Continuing Education
Service, Michigan State University*

- **Welcoming Remarks**

WILLARD H. DUETTING

*Director, Xerox International Center for
Training and Management
Development*

- **Introduction of Agenda and Charge
to the Conference**

DANIEL E. MARVIN, JR.

Chairman-Elect, NACECE

*Director, Council of Higher Education
for the State of Virginia*

- **Introduction of Keynote Speakers**

ARMAND L. HUNTER

- **Keynote Addresses**

9:30 a.m. *Labor*

J. C. TURNER

*President, International Union of
Operating Engineers*

10:00 a.m. *Business*

CHARLES L. BROWN, JR.

*Vice Chairman of the Board,
American Telephone and
Telegraph Company*

11:00 a.m. *Education*

PAUL A. MILLER

*President, Rochester Institute of
Technology*

11:30 a.m. *Government*

THE HONORABLE

ALBERT H. QUIE

*U.S. House of Representatives,
Committee on Education and
Labor*

12:00 Noon • **Speakers React to Addresses**

12:30 p.m. • **Questions from Participants**

Afternoon Session

2:30 p.m. — Workshops

5:30 p.m.

Conference Workshops

Group I

GEORGE PRATT, Discussion Leader
Special Assistant for Education
Office of the Secretary
U.S. Department of Commerce

Whitney Watriss, Recorder
Consultant
NACECE

Group II

WALTER G. DAVIS, Discussion Leader
Director of Education
AFL-CIO

Jessie K. Ulin, Recorder
Director of Research and Evaluation
NACECE

Group III

CHESTER A. FRANCKE, Discussion Leader
Director of Educational Systems and Programs Services
General Motors Corporation

Eugene Welden, Recorder
Chief, Community Service and Continuing Education Programs
U.S. Office of Education

Group IV

JOHN B. ERVIN, Discussion Leader
Dean, School of Continuing Education
Washington University (St. Louis)

Richard F. McCarthy, Recorder
Associate Director
NACECE

Group V

SYLVIA G. McCOLLUM
Education Administrator
Bureau of Prisons
U.S. Department of Justice

Lloyd H. Davis, Recorder
Executive Director
National University Extension Association

Group VI

HERBERT A. LEVINE, Discussion Leader
Director, Labor Education Center
Rutgers University

Robert L. McCan, Recorder
President
Center for Educational Services

8:30 p.m. Discussion Leaders Meet

Tuesday, January 11

8:30 a.m. Conference Reconvenes

• Charge to Workshops

HERBERT A. LEVINE

Director, Labor Education Center, Rutgers University

9:00 a.m. — Workshops Continue
11:30 a.m.

11:30 a.m. Discussion Leaders Meet

12:00 Noon Plenary Session

• Report of Discussion Leaders

SYLVIA G. McCOLLUM

Education Administrator, Bureau of Prisons, U.S. Department of Justice

• Closing Address

THE HONORABLE JACOB K. JAVITS

U.S. Senate, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

• Conclusion

ARMAND L. HUNTER

1:00 p.m. Conference Adjourns

Appendix B: Conference Participants

Dr. Daniel G. Aldrich, Jr.
Chancellor
University of California, Irvine

Mr. Carl P. Andren
Staff Member
Organizations Resources Counsellors, Inc.

Dr. Robert C. Andringa
Minority Staff Director
Committee on Education and Labor
U.S. House of Representatives

Dr. Harvey Averach
Assistant Director for Science Education
National Science Foundation

Mr. Joseph W. Ballew
*Administrative Assistant to General
Secretary-Treasurer*
International Brotherhood of Teamsters Union

Mr. James Beck
Director, Bureau of Training
U.S. Civil Service Commission

* Dr. John L. Blackburn
Vice Chancellor, University Resources
University of Denver

* Dr. Nancy M. Boykin
Director, Continuing Education for Girls
Office of City-Wide Schools
Detroit Public Schools

* NACECE member

Dr. George V. Boyle
President
University and College Labor Education
Association
University of Missouri

Mr. Charles L. Brown
Vice Chairman of the Board
American Telephone and Telegraph Company

Mr. Hoyle S. Bruton
Manager, Personnel Development Division
E.I. duPont de Nemours and Company, Inc.

* Mr. Allison Bryant
Technical Program Training Coordinator
U.S. Department of Housing and Urban
Development

Mr. Ronald J. Caridi
Legislative Assistant
Subcommittee on Select Education
U.S. House of Representatives

* Mr. Thomas Carr
Director of Education
Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense
U.S. Department of Defense

Dr. John L. Chase
Chief, Cooperative Education Branch
Office of Education
U.S. Department of Health, Education,
and Welfare

Mr. Robert L. Craig
Director of Communication
American Society of Training and Development

* Mrs. Ruth O. Crassweller
Duluth, Minnesota Airport Authority

Mr. Charles Crown
Education Director
International Association of Machinists
and Aerospace Workers

Dr. Lloyd H. Davis
Executive Director
National University Extension Association

Mr. Tilton Davis, Jr.
Director of Academic Programs
Office of the Director for Education
Directorate
U.S. Department of the Army

Mr. Walter G. Davis
Director of Education
AFL-CIO

Dr. James R. Dorland
Executive Director
National Association of Public, Continuing,
and Adult Education

Dr. Willard H. Duetting
Director
Xerox International Center for Training
and Management Development

Dr. Rhetaugh G. Dumas
Acting Deputy Director
Division of Manpower Training Programs
National Institute of Mental Health

Mr. Kenneth R. Edwards
Director, Skill Improvement Training
International Brotherhood of Electrical
Workers

Ms. Lilla Engdahl
Staff Representative
Western Interstate Commission for Higher
Education

* Dr. John B. Ervin
Dean, School of Continuing Education
Washington University (St. Louis)

Dr. James A. Farmer, Jr.
Associate Director, Office of the Study
of Continuing Professional Education
University of Illinois

* Mr. Lloyd Feldman
Deputy Director, Office of Policy and Planning
Employment and Training Administration
U.S. Department of Labor

Mr. Kenneth Fischer
Coordinator, Postsecondary Education
Convening Authority
Institute of Educational Leadership

Dr. Chester A. Francke
Director, Educational Systems and
Programs Services
General Motors Corporation

Mr. Gregory Fusco
Minority Counsel
Committee on Labor and Public Welfare
U.S. Senate

Mr. Larry Gage
Counsel, Senate Subcommittee on
Alcoholism and Narcotics
U.S. Senate

Dr. Harry Gardner
Director, Office of External Relations
Office of Commissioner of Education
U.S. Department of Health, Education,
and Welfare

Dr. Peter Gil
Associate Dean
Sloan School of Management
MIT

Dr. Lois Gray
Associate Dean
New York State School for Industrial
and Labor Relations
Cornell University

Dr. Mary E. Grefe
Chairperson
National Advisory Council on
Adult Education

Dr. Paul E. Hadley
Vice President for Academic Affairs
University of Southern California

Dr. Richard Hagemeyer
President
Central Piedmont Community College

Mr. Reese Hammond
Director of Education
International Union of Operating Engineers

Dr. Linda S. Hartsock
Executive Director
Adult Education Association

Dr. Warren Hill
Executive Director
Education Commission of the States

Mr. Wayne L. Horvitz
Member, Board of Directors
National Center for Productivity and
Quality of Working Life

- Dr. Armand L. Hunter
Director, Continuing Education Services
Michigan State University

Mr. Richard C. Hupp
Educational Opportunities Plan Administrator
Kimberly-Clark Corporation

Honorable Jacob K. Javits
Committee on Labor and Public Welfare
U.S. Senate

Mr. Arthur F. Kane
Education Director
American Federation of Government Employees

Mr. Donald Kaniewski
*House Subcommittee on Labor Management
Relations*
U.S. House of Representatives

LTC John M. Keenan
Director, Educational Services Branch
U.S. Marine Corps

Dr. Frances Kelly
*Assistant Branch Chief, Professional
Education*
Office of Director, Naval Education and
Training
U.S. Department of the Navy

Mr. Andrew Kenopensky
National Automotive Coordinator
International Association of Machinists
and Aerospace Workers

Mr. E. T. Keogh
Manager, Management Education
Western Electric Company

Mr. John B. Kulstad
Headquarters Staff, Training
Communications Workers of America

Mr. Archie LaPointe
Executive Vice President
National Manpower Institute

- Dr. C. H. Lawshe
Vice President Emeritus
Purdue University

Dr. Herbert A. Levine
Director, Labor Education Center
Rutgers University

Mr. Robert J. Lohr
Office of the Vice President
Industrial Relations
Bethlehem Steel Corporation

Mr. Alfred P. Love
*Assistant Director of Program Development,
Evaluation & Training*
AFL-CIO

Mr. John R. MacKenzie
Director, Labor Studies Center
Federal City College

- Dr. Daniel E. Marvin, Jr.
Director
Council of Higher Education for the
State of Virginia

Dr. Peter Masiko, Jr.
President
Miami-Dade Community College

Mr. John A. Mawhinney, Jr.
Manager, Employee Relations
Compensation and Staff Planning
Shell Oil Company

Dr. Robert L. McCann
President
Center for Educational Services

Mr. Larry J. McCarty
Representative
International Brotherhood of
Electrical Workers

* Ms. Sylvia G. McCollum
Education Administrator
Bureau of Prisons
U.S. Department of Justice

Mr. Charles W. McDougall
Deputy Administrator Operations
Agricultural Extension Service
U.S. Department of Agriculture

Mr. Bernard Michael
Executive Director
Federal Interagency Committee on Education
Office of Assistant Secretary for Education
U.S. Department of Health, Education,
and Welfare

Ms. Joyce Miller
Vice President
Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers
of America

Dr. Paul A. Miller
President
Rochester Institute of Technology

Mr. John P. Monahan, Jr.
Corporate Director
Management Development and Compensation
Union Carbide Corporation

Mr. Roger D. Mulhollen
Vice President, Corporate Personnel
S. C. Johnson & Son, Inc.

Mr. Mark D. Musick
State Services Officer
Southern Regional Education Board

Mr. Frederick O'Neal
President
Associated Actors and Artists of America

Ms. Joan Patterson
*International Representative for the
Education Department*
International Union of United Auto Workers
of America

Mr. Richard A. Plumb
President
The Journeymen Barbers, Hairdressers,
Cosmetologists and Proprietors'
International Union of America

Dr. George Pratt
Special Assistant for Education
Office of the Secretary
U.S. Department of Commerce

Mr. Robert Quick
Chief, Education Services
U.S. Department of the Air Force

The Honorable Albert H. Quie
Committee on Education and Labor
U.S. House of Representatives

Dr. Corinne J. Rieder
*Associate Director for Education
and Work*
National Institute of Education

Mr. Dominic R. Ruscio
Appropriations Staff Member
Subcommittee on Labor-HEW
U.S. Senate

Mr. William Schroeder
Vice President
Graphic Arts International Union

Mr. John A. Sessions
*Assistant Director, Department of
Education*
AFL-CIO

Mr. James Shipman
Executive Consultant to the President
Kimberly-Clark Corporation

Dr. Virginia B. Smith
Director
Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary
Education
U.S. Department of Health, Education,
and Welfare

Dr. William Snow
Director of Education and Training
Rockwell International

Mr. John Stagg
Education Director
Graphic Arts International Union

Mr. John V. Stewart
Manager, Education and Personnel Research
Ford Motor Company

Mr. J. C. Turner
President
International Union of Operating Engineers

Mr. David N. Tyre
Manager, Personnel Development Division
EXXON Corporation

Dr. Curtis Ulmer
Chairman, Department of Adult Education
University of Georgia

* Dr. Preston Valien
Director, College and University Unit
Bureau of Postsecondary Education
U.S. Department of Health, Education,
and Welfare

Dr. Dyckman W. Vermilye
Executive Director
American Association for Higher Education

Mr. Peter Von Storch
Program Director for Education
IBM Corporation

Dr. J. Eugene Welden
*Chief, Community Service and Continuing
Education Programs*
U.S. Office of Education

Mr. George D. Wheeler
Manager, Executive Development
American Express Company

Dr. Roger Yarrington
Vice President
American Association of Community
and Junior Colleges

NACECE Staff

Dr. James A. Turman
Executive Director

Mr. Richard F. McCarthy
Associate Director

Mrs. Jessie K. Ulin
Director for Research and Evaluation

**Appendix C: Title I of the Higher
Education Act of 1965 (P.L. 89-329,
as amended)**

HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

(P.L. 89-329, as amended)

*Be it enacted by the Senate and
House of Representatives of the
United States of America in Congress
assembled, That this Act may be cited
as the "Higher Education Act of
1965."*

**TITLE I — COMMUNITY SERVICE AND
CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAMS**

**Part A — Community Service and
Continuing Education Programs**

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

Sec. 101 (a) For the purpose of (1) assisting the people of the United States in the solution of community problems such as housing, poverty, government, recreation, employment, youth opportunities, transportation, health, and land use by enabling the Commissioner to make grants under this part to strengthen community service programs of colleges and universities, (2) supporting the expansion of continuing education in colleges and universities and (3) supporting resource materials sharing programs, there are authorized to be appropriated \$40,000,000 for the fiscal years 1977, 1978, and 1979.

(b) For the purpose of carrying out a program for the promotion of lifelong learning in accordance with the provisions of part B, there are authorized to be appropriated, \$20,000,000 for fiscal year 1977, \$30,000,000 for fiscal year

1978, and \$40,000,000 for fiscal year 1979.

**DEFINITION OF COMMUNITY SERVICE
PROGRAM AND CONTINUING EDUCATION
PROGRAM**

Sec. 102 (a) For purposes of this part, the term "community service program" means an educational program, activity, or service including a research program and a university extension or continuing education offering, which is designed to assist in the solution of community problems in rural, urban, or suburban areas, with particular emphasis on urban and suburban problems, where the institution offering such program, activity, or service determines —

- (1) that the proposed program, activity, or service is not otherwise available, and
- (2) that the conduct of the program or performance of the activity or service is consistent with the institution's over-all educational program and is of such a nature as is appropriate to the effective utilization of the institution's special resources and the competencies of its faculty.

Where course offerings are involved, such courses must be university extension or continuing education courses and must be —

- (A) fully acceptable toward an academic degree, or
- (B) of college level as determined by the institution offering such courses.

(b) For purposes of this part, the term "continuing education program" means

postsecondary instruction designed to meet the educational needs and interests of adults, including the expansion of available learning opportunities for adults who are not adequately served by current educational offerings in their communities.

(c) For purposes of this part, the term "resource materials sharing programs" means planning for the improved use of existing community learning resources by finding ways that combinations of agencies, institutions, and organizations can make better use of existing educational materials, communications technology, local facilities, and such human resources as will expand learning opportunities for adults in the area being served.

ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

Sec. 103 (a) From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 101 (a) for any fiscal year which are not reserved under section 106 (a) the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to such sums as the population of such State bears to the population of all the States, except that, for any fiscal year beginning on or after October 1, 1976, no State shall be allotted from such sums less than the amount which such State received during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1974.

(b) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for such fiscal year for carrying out the State plan (if any) approved under this part shall be available for reallocation from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under such subsection for such year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commissioner estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such year for carrying out the State plan; and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallocated among the States whose proportionate amounts were not so reduced. Any amount reallocated to a State under this subsection during a year from funds appropriated pursuant to section 101 shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) for such year.

(c) In accordance with regulations of the Commissioner, any State may file with him a request that a specified portion of its allotment

under this part be added to the allotment of another State under this part for the purpose of meeting a portion of the Federal share of the cost of providing community service programs under this part. If it is found by the Commissioner that the programs with respect to which the request is made would meet needs of the State making the request and that use of the specified portion of such State's allotment, as requested by it, would assist in carrying out the purposes of this part, such portion of such State's allotment shall be added to the allotment of the other State under this part to be used for the purpose referred to above.

(d) The population of a State and of all the States shall be determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data available from the Department of Commerce.

USES OF ALLOTTED FUNDS

Section 104 A State's allotment under section 103 may be used, in accordance with its State plan approved under section 105 (b), to provide new, expanded, or improved community service and continuing education programs, including resource material sharing programs.

STATE PLANS

Sec. 105 (a) Any State desiring to receive its allotment of funds under this part for use in community service and continuing education programs, including resource materials sharing programs, shall designate or create a State agency or institution which has special qualifications with respect to solving community problems and which is broadly representative of institutions of higher education in the State which are competent to offer community service and continuing education programs, including resource materials sharing programs, and shall submit to the Commissioner a State plan. If a State desires to designate for the purpose of this section an existing State agency or institution which does not meet these requirements, it may do so if the agency or institution takes such action as may be necessary to acquire such qualifications and assure participation of such institutions, or if it designates or creates a State advisory council which meets the requirements not met by the designated agency or institution to consult with the designated agency or institution in the preparation of the State plan. A State plan

submitted under this part shall —

- (1) provide that the agency or institution so designated or created shall be the sole agency for administration of the plan or for supervision of the administration of the plan; and provide that such agency or institution shall consult with any State advisory council required to be created by this section with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of such plan;
- (2) set forth a comprehensive, coordinated, and statewide system of community service and continuing education programs, including resource materials sharing programs, under which funds paid to the State (including funds paid to an institution or combination thereof) pursuant to section 107 (c) under its allotments under section 103 will be expended solely for community service and continuing education programs, including resource materials sharing programs which have been approved by the agency or institution administering the plan (except that if a comprehensive, coordinated, and statewide system of community service and continuing education programs, including resource materials sharing programs, cannot be effectively carried out by reason of insufficient funds, the plan may set forth one or more proposals for community service and continuing education programs, including resource materials sharing programs, in lieu of a comprehensive, coordinated, statewide system of such programs);
- (3) set forth the policies and procedures to be followed in allocating Federal funds to institutions of higher education (and combinations thereof) in the State, which policies and procedures shall insure that due consideration will be given —
 - (A) to the relative capacity and willingness of particular institutions of higher education and combinations thereof (whether public or private) to provide effective community service and continuing education programs, including resource materials sharing programs;
 - (B) to the availability of and need for community service and continuing education programs, including resource materials sharing programs, among the population within the State; and
 - (C) to the results of periodic evaluations of the programs carried out under this part;
- (4) set forth policies and procedures designed to assure that Federal funds made available under this part will be so used as not to supplant State or local funds, or funds of institutions of higher education, but to supplement and, to the extent practicable, to increase the amounts of such funds that would in the absence of such Federal funds be made available for community service and continuing education programs, including resource materials sharing programs;
- (5) set forth such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the State (including such funds paid by the State or by the Commissioner to institutions of higher education or combinations thereof) under this part; and
- (6) provide assurances that all institutions of higher education in the State have been given the opportunity to participate in the development of the State plan.
 - (b) The Commissioner shall approve any State plan and any modification thereof which complies with the provisions of subsection (a).
 - (c) The Commissioner shall not by standard, rule, regulation, guideline, or any other means, either formal or informal, require a State to make any agreement or submit any data which is not specifically required by this part.

SPECIAL PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS RELATING TO NATIONAL AND REGIONAL PROBLEMS

Sec. 106 (a) The Commissioner is authorized to reserve from the sums appropriated pursuant to section 101 for any fiscal year an amount not in excess of 10 per centum of the sums so appropriated for that fiscal year for grants pursuant to subsection (b).

(b) (1) From the sums reserved under subsection (a), the Commissioner is authorized to make grants to, and contracts with, institutions of higher education (and combinations thereof) to assist them in carrying out special programs and projects, consistent with the purposes of this part, which are designed to seek solutions to national and regional problems relating to technological and social changes and environmental pollution.

(2) No grant or contract under this section shall exceed 90 per centum of the cost of the program or project for which application is made.

PAYMENTS

Sec. 107 (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), payment under this part shall be made to those State agencies and institutions which administer plans approved under section 105 (b). Payments under this part from a State's allotment with respect to the cost of developing and carrying out its State plan shall equal 75 per centum of such cost for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, 75 per centum of such costs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, 50 per centum of such costs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and 66 2/3 per centum of such costs for the fiscal year ending on or after June 30, 1969, except that no payments for any fiscal year shall be made to any State with respect to expenditures for developing and administering the State plan which exceed 5 per centum of the costs for that year for which payment under this subsection may be made to that State, or \$40,000, whichever is the greater. In determining the cost of developing and carrying out a State's plan, there shall be excluded any cost with respect to which payments were received under any other Federal program.

(b) No payments shall be made to any State from its allotments for any fiscal year unless and until the Commissioner finds that the institutions of higher education which will participate in carrying out the State plan for that year will together have available during that year for expenditure from non-Federal sources for college and university extension and continuing education programs not less than the total amount actually expended by those institutions for college and university extension and continuing education programs from such sources during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, plus an amount equal to not less than the non-Federal share of the costs with respect to which payment pursuant to subsection (a) is sought.

(c) Payments to a State under this part may be made in installments and in advance or by way of reimbursement with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments, and they may be paid directly to the State or to one or more participating institutions of higher education designated for this purpose by the State, or to both.

ADMINISTRATION OF STATE PLANS

Sec. 108 (a) The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under this part, or any modification thereof, without first affording the State agency or institution submitting the plan reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

(b) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency or institution administering a State plan approved under section 105 (b), finds that —

- (1) the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of section 105 (a), or
- (2) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision,

the Commissioner shall notify the State agency or institution that the State will not be regarded as eligible to participate in the program under this part until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

Sec. 109 If a State's plan is not approved under section 105 (b) or a State's eligibility to participate in the program is suspended as a result of the Commissioner's action under section 108 (b), the State may within sixty days after notice of the Commissioner's decision institute a civil action in an appropriate United States district court. In such an action, the court shall determine the matter de nova.

SPECIAL PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS RELATING TO PROBLEMS OF THE ELDERLY

Sec. 110 (a) The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to institutions of higher education (and combinations thereof) to assist such institutions in planning, developing, and carrying out, consistent with the purpose of this part,

programs specifically designed to apply the resources of higher education to the problems of the elderly, particularly with regard to transportation and housing problems of elderly persons living in rural and isolated areas.

(b) For purposes of making grants under this section, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, each succeeding fiscal year ending prior to October 1, 1978, and for the period beginning July 1, 1976, and ending September 30, 1976.

(c) In carrying out the program authorized by this section, the Commissioner shall consult with the Commissioner of the Administration on Aging for the purpose of coordinating, where practicable, the programs assisted under this section with the programs assisted under the Older Americans Act of 1965.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND ADMINISTRATION

Sec. 111 (a) The Commissioner is authorized to reserve not to exceed 10 per centum of the amount appropriated for any fiscal year pursuant to section 101 (a) in excess of \$14,500,000 for the purpose of this section.

(b) From funds reserved under subsection (a) of this section, the Commissioner shall provide technical assistance to the States and to institutions of higher education. Such technical assistance shall —

- (1) provide a national diffusion network to help assure that effective programs are known among such States and institutions;
- (2) assist with the improvement of planning and evaluation procedures; and,
- (3) provide information about the changing enrollment patterns in postsecondary institutions, and provide assistance to such States and institutions in their efforts to understand these changing patterns and to accommodate them.

(c) The Commissioner shall provide for coordination between community service and continuing education programs (including resource materials sharing programs) conducted by him with all other appropriate offices and agencies, including such offices and agencies which administer vocational education programs, adult education programs, career education programs, and student and institutional assistance

programs.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EXTENSION AND CONTINUING EDUCATION

Sec. 112 (a) The President shall, within ninety days of enactment of this part, appoint a National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education (hereafter referred to as the "Advisory Council"), consisting of one representative each of the Department of Agriculture, Commerce, Defense, Labor, Interior, State, and Housing and Urban Development, and the Office of Economic Opportunity, and of such other Federal agencies having extension education responsibilities as the President may designate, and twelve members appointed, for staggered terms and without regard to the civil service laws, by the President. Such twelve members shall, to the extent possible, include persons knowledgeable in the fields of extension and continuing education, State and local officials, and other persons having special knowledge, experience, or qualification with respect to community problems, and persons representative of the general public. The Advisory Council shall meet at the call of the Chairman but not less often than twice a year.

(b) The Advisory Council shall advise the Commissioner in the preparation of general regulations and with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of this part, including policies and procedures governing the approval of State plans under section 105 (b), and policies to eliminate duplication and to effectuate the coordination of programs under this part and other programs offering extension or continuing education activities and services.

(c) The Advisory Council shall review the administration and effectiveness of all federally supported extension and continuing education programs, including community service programs, make recommendations with respect thereto, and make annual reports, commencing on March 31, 1967, of its findings and recommendations (including recommendations for changes in the provisions of this part and other Federal laws relating to extension and continuing education activities) to the Secretary and to the President. The President shall transmit each such report to the Congress together with his comments and recommendations.

(d) In carrying out its functions pursuant to this section, the Advisory Council may utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government, in accordance with

agreements between the Secretary and the head of such agency. Subject to section 448 (b) of the General Education Provisions Act, the Advisory Council shall continue to exist until the programs authorized by this part are terminated.

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PROGRAMS

Sec. 113. Nothing in this section shall modify any authority under the Act of May 8, 1914 (Smith-Lever Act), as amended (7 U.S.C. 341-848).

LIMITATION

Sec. 114. No grant may be made under this part for any educational program, activity, or service related to sectarian instruction or religious worship, or provided by a school or department of divinity.

Part B — Lifelong Learning

FINDINGS

Sec. 131. The Congress finds that —

(1) accelerating social and technological change have had impact on the duration and quality of life;

(2) the American people need lifelong learning to enable them to adjust to social, technological, political and economic changes;

(3) lifelong learning has a role in developing the potential of all persons including improvement of their personal wellbeing, upgrading their workplace skills, and preparing them to participate in the civic, cultural, and political life of the Nation;

(4) lifelong learning is important in meeting the needs of the growing number of older and retired persons;

(5) learning takes place through formal and informal instruction, through educational programs conducted by public and private educational and other institutions and organizations, through independent study, and through the efforts of business, industry, and labor;

(6) planning is necessary at the national, State, and local levels to assure effective use of existing resources in the light of changing characteristics and learning needs of the population;

(7) more effective use should be made of the resources of the Nation's educational institutions in order to assist the people of the United States in the solution of community problems in areas

such as housing, poverty, government, recreation, employment, youth opportunities, transportation, health, and land use; and

(8) American society should have as a goal the availability of appropriate opportunities for lifelong learning for all its citizens without regard to restrictions of previous education or training, sex, age, handicapping condition, social or ethnic background, or economic circumstance.

SCOPE OF LIFELONG LEARNING

Sec. 132. Lifelong learning includes, but is not limited to, adult basic education, continuing education, independent study, agricultural education, business education and labor education, occupational education and job training programs, parent education, postsecondary education, preretirement and education for older and retired people, remedial education, special educational programs for groups or for individuals with special needs, and also educational activities designed to upgrade occupational and professional skills, to assist business, public agencies, and other organizations in the use or innovation and research results, and to serve family needs and personal development.

LIFELONG LEARNING ACTIVITIES

Sec. 133. (a) The Assistant Secretary shall carry out, from funds appropriated pursuant to section 101 (b), a program of planning, assessing, and coordinating projects related to lifelong learning. In carrying out the provisions of this section, the Assistant Secretary shall —

(1) foster improved coordination of Federal support for lifelong learning programs;

(2) act as a clearinghouse for information regarding lifelong learning, including the identification, collection, and dissemination to educators and the public of existing and new information regarding lifelong learning programs which are or may be carried out and supported by any department or agency of the Federal Government;

(3) review present and proposed methods of financing and administering lifelong learning, to determine —

(A) the extent to which each promotes lifelong learning,

(B) program and administrative features of each that contribute to serving lifelong learning,

(C) the need for additional Federal support for

lifelong learning, and

(D) procedures by which Federal assistance to lifelong learning may be better applied and coordinated to achieve the purposes of this part;

(4) review the lifelong learning opportunities provided through employers, unions, the media, libraries and museums, secondary schools and postsecondary educational institutions, and other public and private organizations to determine means by which the enhancement of their effectiveness and coordination may be facilitated;

(5) review existing major foreign lifelong learning programs and related programs in order to determine the applicability of such programs in this country;

(6) identify existing barriers to lifelong learning and evaluate programs designed to eliminate such barriers; and

(7) to the extent practicable, seek the advice and assistance of the agencies of the Education Division (including the Office of Education, the National Institute of Education, the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, and the National Center for Education Statistics), other agencies of the Federal Government, public advisory groups (including the National Advisory Councils on Extension and Continuing Education, Adult Education, Career Education, Community Education, and Vocational Education.) Commissions (including the National Commission on Libraries and Information Sciences and the National Commission on Manpower Policy), State agencies, and such other persons or organizations as may be appropriate, in carrying out the Assistant Secretary's responsibilities, and make maximum use of information and studies already available.

The review required by clause (3) of this subsection shall include —

(i) a comparative assessment of domestic and foreign tax and other incentives to encourage increased commitment of business and labor;

(ii) a study of alternatives such as lifelong learning entitlement programs or educational vouchers designed to assist adults to undertake education or training in conjunction with, or in periods alternative to employment;

(iii) review of possible modifications to existing Federal and State student assistance programs necessary to increase their relevance to the lifelong learning needs of all adults;

(iv) the organization and design of funding for pre- and post-retirement training and education for the elderly; and

(v) modifications to Federal and State man-

power training, public employment, unemployment compensation, and similar funding programs so as to better facilitate lifelong education and training and retraining for employment.

(b) After consultation with appropriate State agencies, the Assistant Secretary is authorized —

(1) to assist in the planning and assessment to determine whether in each State there is an equitable distribution of lifelong learning services to all segments of the adult population;

(2) to assist in assessing the appropriate roles for the Federal, State, and local governments, educational institutions and community organizations; and

(3) to assist in considering alternative methods of financing and delivering lifelong learning opportunities, including —

(A) identification of State agencies, institutions, and groups that plan and provide programs of lifelong learning,

(B) determination of the extent to which programs are available geographically,

(C) a description of demographic characteristics of the population served,

(D) analysis of reasons for attendance in programs of lifelong learning, and

(E) analysis of sources of funds for the conduct of lifelong learning programs, and the financial support of persons attending programs of lifelong learning.

(c) The Assistant Secretary is authorized, with respect to lifelong learning, to assess, evaluate the need for, demonstrate, and develop alternative methods to improve —

(1) research and development activities;

(2) training and retraining people to become educators of adults;

(3) development of curricula and delivery systems appropriate to the needs of any such programs;

(4) development of techniques and systems for guidance and counseling of adults and for training and retraining of counselors;

(5) development and dissemination of instructional materials appropriate to adults;

(6) assessment of the educational needs and goals of older and retired persons and their unique contributions to lifelong learning programs;

(7) use of employer and union tuition assistance and other educational programs, educational and cultural trust funds and other similar educational benefits resulting from collective bargaining agreements, and other private funds for the support of lifelong learning;

(8) integration of public and private educational

funds which encourage participation in lifelong learning, including support of guidance and counseling of workers in order that they can make best use of funds available to them for lifelong learning opportunities; and

(9) coordination within communities among educators, employers, labor organizations, and other appropriate individuals and entities to assure that lifelong learning opportunities are designed to meet projected career and occupational needs of the community, after consideration of the availability of guidance and counseling, the availability of information regarding occupational and career opportunities, and the availability of appropriate educational other resources to meet the career and occupational needs of the community.

(d) In carrying out the provisions of this section the Assistant Secretary is authorized to enter into agreements with, and to make grants to, appropriate State agencies, institutions of higher

education, and public and private nonprofit organizations.

(e) In carrying out the provisions of this section, the Assistant Secretary shall issue reports summarizing research and analysis conducted pursuant to this section, and shall develop the resources and capability to analyze and make recommendations regarding specific legislative or administrative proposals which may be considered by the President or by the Congress.

REPORTS

Sec. 134. The Assistant Secretary shall transmit to the President and to the Congress a report on such results from the activities conducted pursuant to this part as may be completed by January 1, 1978, together with such legislative recommendations as he may deem appropriate. The Assistant Secretary shall similarly report annually thereafter.